

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

October 26th, 1957

"Politics are  
than means  
world."

—SA

## UOUS UNPOPULARITY

under-  
ch has  
s with  
r-leave  
ty. A  
simple  
admits  
its sub-  
tain  
n state  
subjects  
werless  
find it

we are sure some democrat who understands the system better than we do will write in to explain and put us right and make us realise, perhaps, that a sovereign people in a democracy are in fact as right as the chap we once heard of who liked banging his head against a wall because it was so nice when he stopped.

### Self-Praise

Failing this, however, we must admit to being somewhat puzzled by the self-praise currently being indulged in by spokesmen of the Government for their own courage in introducing so many *unpopular* measures. The function of a democratic government is to do things the people want done—in a word *popular* things. Yet all we get are Ministers dashing around the country patting themselves on the back and saying what splendid fellows they are because they are making themselves so thoroughly unpopular.

And they clearly recognise that in doing so they are increasing the feeling among the electorate that there ought to be an election, so that we might have a chance to throw out this unpopular lot. But the Government is determined to hang on and make itself even more unpopular, thereby, we assume, proving its tenacious, bulldog spirit, stern sense of duty, and insistence upon serving the people right whether they like it or not. As Mr. Harold Macmillan, our brilliant Prime Minister (to quote a friend of his), said, 'We are not going to run away'. He is going to stand and dish it out.

Rubbing it in a little further, Dr. Charles Hill said at Derby last week

of the Government's anti-inflation policy: 'However uncomfortable these measures may be, we intend to retain them over the next two years.'

### Courage

Our present Government seems set on showing the world that although it may be afraid of an election it is not afraid of making us thoroughly uncomfortable for the next two years. There's courage for you!

This brave dedication to duty is not to be thought of as a monopoly of the Tories, however. Many others in power have found the courage to do all sorts of unpleasant things to people for their own good. If you read carefully Comrade Khrushchev's courageous repudiation of Stalin, presented to an admiring world three years after the old dictator was safely dead, you will see that there was no denunciation of the unpopular measures which Uncle Joe forced upon the Russian people.

It was, and still is in Communist eyes, a gauge of Stalin's greatness that he was able to make the Russians thoroughly uncomfortable for nearly three decades and maintain himself in power, though unpopular (to put it mildly) even among his own comrades and at a cost of a mere—what?—twenty million lives? This is the stuff of greatness, and even the denunciation of it denotes courage of a high order.

### Devotion to Duty

And after Hungary, no-one can doubt that a Communist Government is the equal of a Conservative

Government in its firm recognition of its duty and its refusal to run away from its responsibilities just because the people hate its guts.

Nor should we imagine for one moment that the more homespun British parties like the Liberals or Labour would be any more cowardly in the face of their duty and historic destiny. Mr. Bevan's courage in clothing himself in the H-Bomb for the sake of humanity has already been highly praised both in these columns and those of the *Daily Express*. Who can doubt after their brave reversals of policy at Brighton that neither Mr. Bevan nor Mr. Cousins would ever flinch from taking unpopular decisions if they conceived them to be in the interests of the nation?

We are, quite clearly, living in stirring times. Not for us the enervating, degenerating atmosphere of appeasement between government and people. Thank goodness we are not to be insulted with the spectacle of a decadent ruling class currying favour with its subjects, of a degenerate senate trying to give its people what they want.

No, none of that perversion of democracy for us. Instead, we have stern righteousness. And as the Government introduces measure after measure which it knows we shall not like, we know, deep down, that it is all for our own good. We can almost hear an echo from days gone by, when father used to get busy with his slipper: 'This hurts me more than it hurts you.'

We didn't believe it then and we don't believe it now.

## All

THE Parliam  
the Admir  
Soames recalled  
a speech to the  
Association in  
speech which w  
last war by Ch  
First Lord of t  
then Prime Min  
if the worst ca  
Fleet would be  
continue the fig  
Soames, in a t  
said that in the  
war" as man  
would be got  
away to sea so  
vive the nuclear

At a first glan  
to be an excell  
up in the Navy  
lucky enough t  
the ones that ge  
thoughts do not  
view, for it is  
to sea but when  
there? The as  
nuclear war will  
local to allow th  
where worth goi  
to a part of th  
radio-activity an  
plosions—there  
fight. . . .

Mr. Soames  
unconscious of  
views, which are  
"It is true that  
what is common  
back' war, which  
a nuclear assault  
be the first phase  
low down in the  
military expenditure  
do not govern even  
with a global war  
defend ourselves  
got."

So far as see  
lag between a n  
first phase"—and  
war would be  
not days or week  
then on survival  
academic questio  
or sea, the prob  
ourselves" hardl  
terms of destroy  
quickly and aff

## SPUTNIKITIS

THE full implications of Sputnik's arrival off the scene are as yet unknown. On the one hand it is

the USSR is in a position to unleash a counter-offensive (in the event of being attacked) against the USSR,

Communist system as roughly equal in strength to the existing material-capitalist Western system. But



**In this Issue :**

**Nineteen Days that Shook  
the Communists - p. 2**

**Ensuring Hunger - p. 3**

**A Letter to Somebody - p. 3**

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 18, No. 43

October 26th, 1957

## VIRTUOUS UNPOPULARITY

**P**RESUMABLY one can understand a government which has forced itself upon its subjects without so much as a by-your-leave caring nothing for popularity. A dictatorship, by virtue of the simple fact of being a dictatorship, admits to the world that whatever its subjects think it intends to maintain itself in power. A totalitarian state takes total power over its subjects and renders them totally powerless to dispose of it should they find it unsatisfactory.

It is, surely, the supposed difference between a dictatorship and a democracy that whereas the former cares not at all for the approval of its citizens, the democracy is a popular government. A democratically elected government is, after all, the people's choice. At an election the electorate—which in this country means all good citizens of both sexes over 21 and still not certified insane—is presented with alternatives (so the story goes) and they choose the party which they think is going to do right by them.

The very word democracy means people governing themselves and it is patently ridiculous to think of people governing themselves in a way they don't like when the people are sovereign, and not certified insane. Surely when people govern themselves the policies of their elected representatives, who take power only to serve them in the way they desire (or deserve), *must* be popular.

Or something is wrong somewhere.

Perhaps it is in our reasoning that something is wrong, in which case

we are sure some democrat who understands the system better than we do will write in to explain and put us right and make us realise, perhaps, that a sovereign people in a democracy are in fact as right as the chap we once heard of who liked banging his head against a wall because it was so nice when he stopped.

### Self-Praise

Failing this, however, we must admit to being somewhat puzzled by the self-praise currently being indulged in by spokesmen of the Government for their own courage in introducing so many *unpopular* measures. The function of a democratic government is to do things the people want done—in a word popular things. Yet all we get are Ministers dashing around the country patting themselves on the back and saying what splendid fellows they are because they are making themselves so thoroughly unpopular.

And they clearly recognise that in doing so they are increasing the feeling among the electorate that there ought to be an election, so that we might have a chance to throw out this unpopular lot. But the Government is determined to hang on and make itself even more unpopular, thereby, we assume, proving its tenacious, bulldog spirit, stern sense of duty, and insistence upon serving the people right whether they like it or not. As Mr. Harold Macmillan, our brilliant Prime Minister (to quote a friend of his), said, 'We are not going to run away'. He is going to stand and dish it out.

Rubbing it in a little further, Dr. Charles Hill said at Derby last week

of the Government's anti-inflation policy: 'However uncomfortable these measures may be, we intend to retain them over the next two years.'

### Courage

Our present Government seems set on showing the world that although it may be afraid of an election it is not afraid of making us thoroughly uncomfortable for the next two years. There's courage for you!

This brave dedication to duty is not to be thought of as a monopoly of the Tories, however. Many others in power have found the courage to do all sorts of unpleasant things to people for their own good. If you read carefully Comrade Khrushchev's courageous repudiation of Stalin, presented to an admiring world three years after the old dictator was safely dead, you will see that there was no denunciation of the unpopular measures which Uncle Joe forced upon the Russian people.

It was, and still is in Communist eyes, a gauge of Stalin's greatness that he was able to make the Russians thoroughly uncomfortable for nearly three decades and maintain himself in power, though unpopular (to put it mildly) even among his own comrades and at a cost of a mere—what?—twenty million lives? This is the stuff of greatness, and even the denunciation of it denotes courage of a high order.

### Devotion to Duty

And after Hungary, no-one can doubt that a Communist Government is the equal of a Conservative

Government in its discharge of its duty and away from its responsibilities because the people

Nor should we forget the moment that the British parties like Labour would be likely in the face of their historic destiny. Mr. in clothing himself for the sake of human been highly praised in columns and the *Express*. Who can brave reversals of that neither Mr. Cousins would be taking unpopular conceived them to of the nation?

We are, quite stirring times. No vating, degeneration, appeasement between and people. They are not to be insulted of a decadent, trying favour with degenerate senate people what they

No, none of the democracy for us. stern righteousness. Government into after measure which shall not like, we that it is all for our can almost hear a gone by, when busy with his slip me more than it h

We didn't believe don't believe it no

## More Political Instinct, Please!

**D**URING the election campaign in West Germany, Economic Minister Ludwig Erhard, after making 86 speeches promising no price increases if voters stuck with Adenauer has been badly let

## SPUTNIKITIS

**T**HE full implications of Sputnik's arrival on the scene are as yet unknown. On the one hand it is

the USSR is in a position to unleash a counter-offensive (in the event of being attacked) against the USSR.

Communist system in strength to the list-capitalist We



its citizens, the democracy is a popular government. A democratically elected government is, after all, the people's choice. At an election the electorate—which in this country means all good citizens of both sexes over 21 and still not certified insane—is presented with alternatives (so the story goes) and they choose the party which they think is going to do right by them.

The very word democracy means people governing themselves and it is patently ridiculous to think of people governing themselves in a way they don't like when the people are sovereign, and not certified insane. Surely when people govern themselves the policies of their elected representatives, who take power only to serve them in the way they desire (or deserve), *must* be popular.

Or something is wrong somewhere.

Perhaps it is in our reasoning that something is wrong, in which case

democratic government is to do things the people want done—in a word popular things. Yet all we get are Ministers dashing around the country patting themselves on the back and saying what splendid fellows they are because they are making themselves so thoroughly unpopular.

And they clearly recognise that in doing so they are increasing the feeling among the electorate that there ought to be an election, so that we might have a chance to throw out this unpopular lot. But the Government is determined to hang on and make itself even more unpopular, thereby, we assume, proving its tenacious, bulldog spirit, stern sense of duty, and insistence upon serving the people right whether they like it or not. As Mr. Harold Macmillan, our brilliant Prime Minister (to quote a friend of his), said, 'We are not going to run away'. He is going to stand and dish it out.

Rubbing it in a little further, Dr. Charles Hill said at Derby last week

do all sorts of unpleasant things to people for their own good. If you read carefully Comrade Khrushchev's courageous repudiation of Stalin, presented to an admiring world three years after the old dictator was safely dead, you will see that there was no denunciation of the unpopular measures which Uncle Joe forced upon the Russian people.

It was, and still is in Communist eyes, a gauge of Stalin's greatness that he was able to make the Russians thoroughly uncomfortable for nearly three decades and maintain himself in power, though unpopular (to put it mildly) even among his own comrades and at a cost of a mere—what?—twenty million lives? This is the stuff of greatness, and even the denunciation of it denotes courage of a high order.

### Devotion to Duty

And after Hungary, no-one can doubt that a Communist Government is the equal of a Conservative

Cousins would taking unpopular conceived them of the nation?

We are, quite stirring times. N vating, degenerate appeasement bet and people. Th are not to be insu tacle of a decader rying favour with degenerate senate people what the

No, none of democracy for us, stern righteousness Government int after measure w shall not like, we that it is all for o can almost hear gone by, when f busy with his sh me more than it h

We didn't belie don't believe it no

## More Political Instinct, Please!

DURING the election campaign in West Germany, Economic Minister Ludwig Erhard, after making 86 speeches promising no price increases if voters stuck with Adenauer has been badly let down by the large Ruhr coalmine managers association who four days after the election campaign announced a price rise of 7/4 a ton.

Attacking them for having the political instinct of horses, Erhard told 250 of them at an emergency meeting in Essen: "This has hit like a bomb. You have abused the government. Your price increase is out of the question. I will shoot at you with all my guns."

It is reported that the coalmen's price break threatened other rises from steel to bread; trade unions broke into a chorus of wage demands, topped by the 1,600,000-member Metal Workers' Union's cry for a 10% boost.

Last week Erhard appealed to the six-nation European Coal and Steel Community at Luxembourg to withhold approval of the Ruhr coal-price increase. To back up the appeal, Erhard wheeled up his biggest price-stabilising weapon—his power to let more competing imports into the country. As a starter, he ordered his ministry to prepare schemes to slash rail freights on foreign oil and American coal. At week's end the mine managers were still holding their prices up, and Erhard was stubbornly getting ready to fire the gun of low-priced imports that always in the past has knocked them down.

If only the mine managers had the political instincts of politicians instead of horses they would find the patience to hang on a bit before raising their prices. After all, it is never long before the public forget what was said during election time. In a few months' time the coalmen could have quietly raised their prices and nobody would have thought any more about it.

## SPUTNIKITIS

THE full implications of Sputnik's arrival off the scene are as yet unknown. On the one hand it is stated that the ability to place a satellite in a stable orbit round the earth is conclusive proof of the possession of a reliable inter-continental ballistic weapon, but alternatively it is stated with equal force that such an assumption is very far from being an established fact.

Some would have us believe that a little thing like a satellite is merely elementary stuff compared with the complications involved in directing an explosive missile from say, Washington or its environs to, say, Moscow or thereabouts. Others are most anxious to impress upon us that if you can achieve a Sputnik, then it almost goes without saying that to direct an explosive missile from, say, Moscow to, say, Washington is simplicity itself.

Whichever argument is correct, though in all probability both are quite inaccurate, the point is somewhat superfluous. What is perhaps of greater moment is the actual effect which Sputnik is having upon world opinion and world thinking. However it is necessary to state why the point is of such little importance; it is for this reason. If the USSR does *not* possess an ICBM then they cannot use it, if the USSR does possess such a contrivance its existence is virtually cancelled out either because the USA also possesses one (which seems unlikely at this particular time), or for the reason that the USA by virtue of its alliances and pacts with countries which surround

the USSR is in a position to unleash a counter-offensive (in the event of being attacked) against the USSR, which will at least be sufficient to deter that country as much as the USA is itself deterred, from making an attack in the first place.

In other words Russian technological achievement is roughly equal, expressed in terms of aggression, to American technological achievement plus geographical position.

Hitherto the USA has considered itself in a superior position to the USSR—it was reckoned that both countries would have to use the old-fashioned aeroplane to make a successful attack. This left the USA in a better position mainly on geographical grounds. Now it may well be that this state of superiority no longer exists, and has been replaced by one of equality. This, in a sense, could be regarded as a balance of power devoutly to be wished, for if neither side is convinced of its own ability to win then neither side will risk an attack.

From all of which it may be deduced that the important thing is the international game of consequences—or what the world thinks.

Sputnik is reported as having made a tremendous impact upon the nations of Afro-Asia; this is understandable, and from an American point of view a deafening blow. The hundreds of millions of Afro-Asians have no doubt regarded the battle of the giants of East and West as an ideological hostility based on differences in economic and political structure, with the "up-and-coming"

Communist system in strength to the list-capitalist West where Communism edge over Capitalism rational type of cerned, Capitalism greater measure of of a better stand in the main to technological prog have a startling general attitudes, represents the point technology has ov

This is very fact truth on all levels question, but for the thin end of the the Russians are ward people, they selves out of the laces and Commu be said to work.

It would be idle is all quite as sim may well be the which is going of uncommitted people world, particular peoples have no pathetic towards t done so little for

It is all very da rible expression o it appears to be sides, despite the neither side is wo

That the grou either side shou ability to destroy only frightening but is also a horri a completely fals



# Freedom

## THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

October 26th, 1957

Threepence

"Politics are now nothing more than means of rising in the world."

—SAMUEL JOHNSON.

## UNPOPULARITY

democrat who  
stem better than  
to explain and  
make us realise,  
foreign people in  
fact as right as  
ard of who liked  
against a wall be-  
when he stopped.

of the Government's anti-inflation policy: 'However uncomfortable these measures may be, we intend to retain them over the next two years.'

### Courage

Our present Government seems set on showing the world that although it may be afraid of an election it is not afraid of making us thoroughly uncomfortable for the next two years. There's courage for you!

This brave dedication to duty is not to be thought of as a monopoly of the Tories, however. Many others in power have found the courage to do all sorts of unpleasant things to people for their own good. If you read carefully Comrade Khrushchev's courageous repudiation of Stalin, presented to an admiring world three years after the old dictator was safely dead, you will see that there was no denunciation of the unpopular measures which Uncle Joe forced upon the Russian people.

It was, and still is in Communist eyes, a gauge of Stalin's greatness that he was able to make the Russians thoroughly uncomfortable for nearly three decades and maintain himself in power, though unpopular (to put it mildly) even among his own comrades and at a cost of a mere—what?—twenty million lives? This is the stuff of greatness, and even the denunciation of it denotes courage of a high order.

### Devotion to Duty

And after Hungary, no-one can doubt that a Communist Government is the equal of a Conservative

Government in its firm recognition of its duty and its refusal to run away from its responsibilities just because the people hate its guts.

Nor should we imagine for one moment that the more homespun British parties like the Liberals or Labour would be any more cowardly in the face of their duty and historic destiny. Mr. Bevan's courage in clothing himself in the H-Bomb for the sake of humanity has already been highly praised both in these columns and those of the *Daily Express*. Who can doubt after their brave reversals of policy at Brighton that neither Mr. Bevan nor Mr. Cousins would ever flinch from taking unpopular decisions if they conceived them to be in the interests of the nation?

We are, quite clearly, living in stirring times. Not for us the enervating, degenerating atmosphere of appeasement between government and people. Thank goodness we are not to be insulted with the spectacle of a decadent ruling class currying favour with its subjects, of a degenerate senate trying to give its people what they want.

No, none of that perversion of democracy for us. Instead, we have stern righteousness. And as the Government introduces measure after measure which it knows we shall not like, we know, deep down, that it is all for our own good. We can almost hear an echo from days gone by, when father used to get busy with his slipper: 'This hurts me more than it hurts you.'

We didn't believe it then and we don't believe it now.

## All at Sea

THE Parliamentary Secretary to the Admiralty, Mr. Christopher Soames recalled only too vividly in a speech to the R.N.V.R. Officers' Association in London recently, a speech which was made during the last war by Churchill—at one time First Lord of the Admiralty. The then Prime Minister had stated that if the worst came to the worst the Fleet would be taken to Canada to continue the fight from there. Mr. Soames, in a burst of enthusiasm, said that in the event of a "global war" as many ships as possible would be got out of the ports and away to sea so that they might survive the nuclear attack.

At a first glance this might appear to be an excellent reason for joining up in the Navy in the hope of being lucky enough to be aboard one of the ones that gets away, but second thoughts do not support this escapist view, for it is all very well to get to sea but where does one go from there? The assumption is that a nuclear war will remain sufficiently local to allow the Fleet to go somewhere worth going to; that is to say to a part of the world free from radio-activity and other nuclear explosions—there to continue the fight. . . .

Mr. Soames appears to be quite unconscious of the absurdity of his views, which are as follows:

"It is true that preparations to fight what is commonly termed a 'broken-back' war, which may or may not follow a nuclear assault which would inevitably be the first phase of a total war, comes low down in the order of priorities for military expenditure. . . . But priorities do not govern events, and if we are faced with a global war we would of course defend ourselves with all that we have got."

So far as seems likely the time lag between a nuclear assault—"the first phase"—and the onset of a total war would be a matter of hours, not days or weeks—but hours. From then on survival becomes almost an academic question, whether on land or sea, the problem of "defending ourselves" hardly arises, except in terms of destroying the attacker as quickly and efficiently as he is des-

## SPUTNIKITIS

ons of Sputnik's  
scene are as yet  
one hand it is

the USSR is in a position to unleash a counter-offensive (in the event of being attacked) against the USSR,

Communist system as roughly equal in strength to the existing materialist-capitalist Western system. But



tion of a demo-  
one—in a word  
et all we get are  
round the coun-  
ves on the back  
splendid fellows  
they are making  
ughly unpopular.  
recognise that in  
e increasing the  
electorate that  
election, so that  
chance to throw  
er lot. But the  
etermined to hang  
f even more un-  
e assume, prov-  
dog spirit, stern  
insistence upon  
e right whether  
As Mr. Harold  
liant Prime Min-  
end of his), said,  
o run away'. He  
ad dish it out.  
little further, Dr.  
Derby last week

in power have found the courage to do all sorts of unpleasant things to people for their own good. If you read carefully Comrade Khrushchev's courageous repudiation of Stalin, presented to an admiring world three years after the old dictator was safely dead, you will see that there was no denunciation of the unpopular measures which Uncle Joe forced upon the Russian people.

It was, and still is in Communist eyes, a gauge of Stalin's greatness that he was able to make the Russians thoroughly uncomfortable for nearly three decades and maintain himself in power, though unpopular (to put it mildly) even among his own comrades and at a cost of a mere—what?—twenty million lives? This is the stuff of greatness, and even the denunciation of it denotes courage of a high order.

#### Devotion to Duty

And after Hungary, no-one can doubt that a Communist Government is the equal of a Conservative

that neither Mr. Bevan nor Mr. Cousins would ever flinch from taking unpopular decisions if they conceived them to be in the interests of the nation?

We are, quite clearly, living in stirring times. Not for us the enervating, degenerating atmosphere of appeasement between government and people. Thank goodness we are not to be insulted with the spectacle of a decadent ruling class currying favour with its subjects, of a degenerate senate trying to give its people what they want.

No, none of that perversion of democracy for us. Instead, we have stern righteousness. And as the Government introduces measure after measure which it knows we shall not like, we know, deep down, that it is all for our own good. We can almost hear an echo from days gone by, when father used to get busy with his slipper: 'This hurts me more than it hurts you.'

We didn't believe it then and we don't believe it now.

to be an excellent reason for joining up in the Navy in the hope of being lucky enough to be aboard one of the ones that gets away, but second thoughts do not support this escapist view, for it is all very well to get to sea but where does one go from there? The assumption is that a nuclear war will remain sufficiently local to allow the Fleet to go somewhere worth going to; that is to say to a part of the world free from radio-activity and other nuclear explosions—there to continue the fight. . . .

Mr. Soames appears to be quite unconscious of the absurdity of his views, which are as follows:

"It is true that preparations to fight what is commonly termed a 'broken-back' war, which may or may not follow a nuclear assault which would inevitably be the first phase of a total war, comes low down in the order of priorities for military expenditure. . . . But priorities do not govern events, and if we are faced with a global war we would of course defend ourselves with all that we have got."

So far as seems likely the time lag between a nuclear assault—"the first phase"—and the onset of a total war would be a matter of hours, not days or weeks—but hours. From then on survival becomes almost an academic question, whether on land or sea, the problem of "defending ourselves" hardly arises, except in terms of destroying the attacker as quickly and efficiently as he is destroying you. In any event everyone is effectively destroyed.

For politicians to talk in terms of nuclear warfare other than as the quickest way to world suicide is to say the least, misleading and irresponsible. Most scientists and some politicians are by now fully aware that there is no defence against nuclear attack. It has been admitted, and it is insane to suppose that once such an attack has been made it will not cause retaliation and therefore ultimate destruction for the whole human race.

#### Hints to Thorneycroft

For the first time since the 1948 Soviet blockade, the Communists this week shut off German traffic on the *Autobahn* linking West Berlin and West Germany. Armed Red Police forbade anyone to leave East Berlin and searched anyone trying to enter it. With his state thus sealed off, East German Premier Grotewohl went on the air at 8 a.m. Sunday to jolt his people out of bed. Grotewohl gave East Germans just 14 hours to hand in all their currency. Sleepy-eyed, they rushed to special conversion centres to get one new mark for each old one. No one was allowed to carry away more than 300 of the new marks (about £5 15s. 0d.); the rest was payable after a six-day wait. Unable to cross the border, businessmen and bankers in West Berlin found themselves in helpless possession of millions of East German marks that by nightfall had become worthless.

Time, 21/10/57.

## SPUTNIK IT IS

tions of Sputnik's scene are as yet one hand it is ability to place a orbit round the proof of the pos- inter-continental but alternatively it al force that such ery far from being

us believe that satellite is merely compared with the lved in directing missile from say, environs to, say, ounts. Others are impress upon us hieve a Sputnik, es without saying explosive missile w to, say, Wash- itself.

ment is correct, ability both are he point is some- What is perhaps

is the actual effect aving upon world thinking. How- y to state why the tle importance; it If the USSR does M then they can- SSR does possess e its existence is out either because sses one (which t this particular reason that the its alliances and es which surround

the USSR is in a position to unleash a counter-offensive (in the event of being attacked) against the USSR, which will at least be sufficient to deter that country as much as the USA is itself deterred, from making an attack in the first place.

In other words Russian technological achievement is roughly equal, expressed in terms of aggression, to American technological achievement plus geographical position.

Hitherto the USA has considered itself in a superior position to the USSR—it was reckoned that both countries would have to use the old-fashioned aeroplane to make a successful attack. This left the USA in a better position mainly on geographical grounds. Now it may well be that this state of superiority no longer exists, and has been replaced by one of equality. This, in a sense, could be regarded as a balance of power devoutly to be wished, for if neither side is convinced of its own ability to win then neither side will risk an attack.

From all of which it may be deduced that the important thing is the international game of consequences—or what the world thinks.

Sputnik is reported as having made a tremendous impact upon the nations of Afro-Asia; this is understandable, and from an American point of view a deafening blow. The hundreds of millions of Afro-Asians have no doubt regarded the battle of the giants of East and West as an ideological hostility based on differences in economic and political structure, with the "up-and-coming"

Communist system as roughly equal in strength to the existing materialist-capitalist Western system. But where Communism might have an edge over Capitalism so far as a rational type of society was concerned, Capitalism had achieved a greater measure of success in terms of a better standard of living due in the main to a higher state of technological progress. Sputnik may have a startling effect upon these general attitudes, for it apparently represents the point at which Eastern technology has overtaken the West.

This is very far from being the truth on all levels except the one in question, but for many people it is the thin end of the wedge, for them the Russians are no longer a backward people, they have lifted themselves out of the mire by their boot-laces and Communism can therefore be said to work.

It would be idle to suggest that it is all quite as simple as that, but it may well be *the kind of thinking* which is going on in the minds of uncommitted peoples throughout the world, particularly where those peoples have no reason to be sympathetic towards the West which has done so little for them.

It is all very dangerous, and a terrible expression of a world in which it appears to be obligatory to take sides, despite the obvious fact that neither side is worth supporting.

That the grounds for supporting either side should be its greater ability to destroy the other is not only frightening in its irrationality but is also a horrifying indication of a completely false set of values.



## THE NINETEEN DAYS by George Urban. Heinemann, 30s.

THE significance of an event is not always measured by its size or its success and it would therefore be hasty to dismiss Hungary's abortive October Revolution as something buried in history. Defeat for a revolting nation, and the restoration of Soviet domination, might seem to be indisputable facts—but only if we see human destiny as something conducted and decided by men in power manipulating the apparatus of their authority.

What happened last year in Hungary, as with the effects of plague or the coming of literacy to backward people, will be carried indefinitely into the future, and most obviously in the following three ways. The Hungarian people themselves, in the short period when there was no effective central authority, spontaneously and without experience, turned naturally to what seemed a fundamental way of organising their society—through workers' councils and individual responsibility. Secondly, the tens of thousands of disaffected Russian soldiers, withdrawn from Hungary because they refused to kill those whom they could not possibly regard as the enemy, carried home their horror and revulsion. Finally, there comes proof that the indoctrination of youth can never lead to absolute or predictable results.

In *Ten Days that Shook the World*, John Reed wrote: "Just as historians search the records for the minutest details of the Paris Commune, so they will want to know what happened in Petrograd in November, 1917, the spirit that animated the people, and how the leaders

# Nineteen Days That Shook

looked, talked and acted." *The Nineteen Days* by George Urban is a record of how the Revolution, exactly thirty-nine years later, had progressed to the point of shooting down the workers of Budapest. As in the earlier book, the naked drama of events is successfully captured, the numerous manifestoes carefully documented, the personalities revealed, the feeling conveyed of a possibly momentous figure. Although there is no Lenin or Trotsky, as at Petrograd, to add the significance of famous leaders, a truer perspective of a revolutionary situation is created by the legion of minor heroes thrown up by the spontaneous forces of the moment.

The Nineteen Days are now familiar history and rather than repeat what is already widely known, it might be useful to reflect on events after the space of a year. At the time, for example, there was some optimism among anar-

chists that the setting up of workers' councils and the peasants' spontaneous responsibility for supplying the towns with food might be the beginning of more far-reaching social changes. Particularly with the breakdown of the central authorities and the movement for regional autonomy. This regional autonomy, however, to quote *The Nineteen Days*, quickly became the nucleus of a rival government:—"Early in the morning of Wednesday, 31 October, the whole of Transdanubia came under the central authority of the Transdanubian National Council with its seat at Győr. It was a properly formed regional parliament, each of the National Councils of the affiliated countries being represented by four, and the affiliated cities by two, deputies. The outstanding feature of this rival authority was its working-class character, for it comprised, over and above the West Hungarian counties, the

National Council Workers' Council Budapest."

There was no doubt that had the influence of the Camerounian system of Smallholders and perhaps a union movement, the country's status might have been another neutral. It suggests that the support of those who hoped for a libertarian. What the shootings and forced confessions of intellectuals, and the consequences of white interpretation.

There is, however, violence and the most highly-pitched remain aloof from as much subjective is the most extreme authority or pur reasons, irrespective of injustice, and, themselves, creates its certainty of ultimate at AVO Security soldiers for various freedoms, but food, means a war for the price of truth in the inevitable society, if there is some time, become sible to recognise truths, then what by shooting without shooting, who have never strain and suffering ditions of the most only honest to re predict, in similar own reaction.

Looking back, vices and treachery, communist government authorities, and revolutionary for their tragedy. On Russians launched after they had been men into the country. Command began Hungarians about tion of their troo three conditions: destroyed Red A desecrated Russian

## PEOPLE AND IDEAS A Million Private Dreams - I

"The landscape that he was looking at recurred so often in his dreams that he was never fully certain whether or not he had seen it in the real world. In his waking thoughts he called it the Golden Country . . ."

GEORGE ORWELL.

"There is in everyone a mental and spiritual country which is their own, a sort of ideal environment which they make for themselves as children. They seek, as adults, a 'real' scenery as much like it as possible; that is, of course, that tiny minority which is able to seek anything but a bare survival at a decent level of perception."

—EDWARD HYAMS.



BEHIND all our purposive activities, our domestic and social arrangements, our positive commitments to the outside world, our ideologies, is the ideal landscape, the 'world-view' or 'life-style', which we have acquired in childhood. It sifts through our selective and self-censored memory as a myth and idyll of the way things ought to be, the lost paradise to be regained.

In his essay *On Memory and Childhood Amnesia*, Ernest Schachtel writes:

"Mankind's belief in a lost paradise is repeated in the belief held by most people in the individual myth of their happy childhood. Like most myths this one contains elements of both truth and illusion, is woven out of wishes, hopes, remembrance and sorrow, and hence has more than one meaning . . ."

The myth, he thinks, takes the place of the lost memory of the "actual riches, spontaneity, freshness of childhood experience." And he declares that "each genuine recovery of forgotten experience and, with it, something of the person that one was when having the experience carries with it an element of enrichment, adds to the light of consciousness, and

since the nineteenth century, we have been fixing on one kind of person or another, one group of people or another, to satisfy our yearning . . . everyone searching for innocence, for simplicity and integrity of life."

You can scarcely open a conversation or a book, without running into somebody's private dream. Here, for instance in Orwell's glimpse-through-a-window at the 'perfect symmetry' of family life:

"Especially on winter evenings after tea, when the fire glows in the open range and dances mirrored in the steel fender, when Father, in shirtsleeves, sits in the rocking chair at one side of the fire, reading the racing finals, and Mother sits on the other with her sewing, and the children are happy with a pennorth of mint humbugs, and the dog lolls roasting himself on the rag mat."

Or here, from the much discussed *Not By Bread Alone*, is Dudintsev's private dream:

"In Galitski's home and family, everything was permeated by a particular kind of lovable simplicity which cannot be imitated or faked and therefore is not often met with. It was a family where there were many children, where everything was clean but lying about untidily, where the furniture was simple and inexpensive, and where generous helpings are served at table."

Often, of course, in the hierarchy of private dreams, domestic bliss is simply what you fall back on when all else fails. This dialogue with a leaving-age school-girl comes from the book *Crestwood Heights*:

Me: What do you want in life?

Jane: A million dollars.

Me: Is that all?

Jane: Oh well, to be famous, to make a contribution. . . .

Me: What do you think you will get?

Jane: Marriage—children—an average family—an average amount of money.

## FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

(Open 10 a.m.—6.30 p.m., 5 p.m. Sats.)

### New Books . . .

More Prayers and Graces

A. M. Laing & Mervyn Peake 6/-  
The Responsibility of Peoples

Dwight Macdonald 21/-

The Roots of American

Communism T. Draper 40/-

The Dynamics of Anxiety and

Hysteria H. J. Eysenck 32/-

Marxism and the Open Mind

John Lewis 25/-

This Way Delight: a Book of

Poetry for the Young

Herbert Read 15/-

Will the Atom Unite the

World? A. Angelopoulos 16/-

Declaration (ed.) T. Maschler 18/-

Mental Seduction and Menticide

J. A. M. Meerloo 21/-

The Offenders Giles Playfair

and D. Sington 25/-

A Bit Off the Map Angus Wilson 13/6

Forgotten Islands of the South

Seas Bengt Danielsson 18/-

Pointing the Way Martin Buber 25/-

### Cheap Editions and Reprints . . .

The Song in the Green Thorn

Tree James Barke 3/6

Sight Without Glasses

H. M. Peppard 3/6

Three Great Irishmen Shaw

## Anar

IT was with ver anarchists wate gramme last week the viewing public

We had an ad the programme w the announceme Times and asked they mean chaos



John Reed wrote: "Just as historians search the records for the minutest details of the Paris Commune, so they will want to know what happened in Petrograd in November, 1917, the spirit that animated the people, and how the leaders

## FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

### OPEN DAILY

(Open 10 a.m.—6.30 p.m., 5 p.m. Sats.)

#### New Books . . .

- More Prayers and Graces  
A. M. Laing & Mervyn Peake 6/-  
The Responsibility of Peoples  
Dwight Macdonald 21/-  
The Roots of American  
Communism T. Draper 40/-  
The Dynamics of Anxiety and  
Hysteria H. J. Eysenck 32/-  
Marxism and the Open Mind  
John Lewis 25/-  
This Way Delight: a Book of  
Poetry for the Young  
Herbert Read 15/-  
Will the Atom Unite the  
World? A. Angelopoulos 16/-  
Declaration (ed.) T. Maschler 18/-  
Mental Seduction and Menticide  
J. A. M. Meerloo 21/-  
The Offenders Giles Playfair  
and D. Sington 25/-  
A Bit Off the Map Angus Wilson 13/6  
Forgotten Islands of the South  
Seas Bengt Danielsson 18/-  
Pointing the Way Martin Buber 25/-

#### Cheap Editions and Reprints . . .

- The Song in the Green Thorn  
Tree James Barke 3/6  
Sight Without Glasses  
H. M. Peppard 3/6  
Three Great Irishmen: Shaw,  
Yeats, Joyce Arland Ussher 4/-  
Dialogues A. N. Whitehead 4/-  
The Sun Also Rises  
Ernest Hemingway 2/6  
The Biosocial Nature of Man  
Ashley Montagu 7/-

#### Second-Hand . . .

- Bertha von Suttner  
Caroline E. Playne 4/6  
Israel: the Establishment of a  
State Harry Sacher 8/-  
Britain and the Beast  
(ed.) Clough Williams-Ellis 3/6  
Our National Ill-Health Service  
Sir Sheldon Dudley 6/-  
Social Evils and their Remedy  
Leo Tolstoy 3/6  
Liberty To-day C. E. M. Joad 3/-  
The Smaller Democracies  
E. D. Simon 2/6  
So Many Hungers  
Bhabani Bhattacharya 2/6  
John Ruskin, his Life and  
Teaching Marshall Mather 3/-  
Death of a Salesman  
Arthur Miller 2/6

#### Pamphlets . . .

- The Great Resistance:  
a Hopi Anthology 2/6

#### Periodicals . . .

- University Libertarian  
Autumn 1957 1/-

We can supply ANY book required, including text-books. Please supply publisher's name if possible, but if not, we can find it. Scarce and out-of-print books searched for—and frequently found!

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

27, RED LION STREET,  
LONDON, W.C.1

he returned so often in his mind that he was never fully certain whether or not he had seen it in the real world. In his waking thoughts he called it the Golden Country . . ."

GEORGE ORWELL.

"There is in everyone a mental and spiritual country which is their own, a sort of ideal environment which they make for themselves as children. They seek, as adults, a 'real' scenery as much like it as possible; that is, of course, that tiny minority which is able to seek anything but a bare survival at a decent level of perception."

—EDWARD HYAMS.

★

BEHIND all our purposive activities, our domestic and social arrangements, our positive commitments to the outside world, our ideologies, is the ideal landscape, the 'world-view' or 'life-style', which we have acquired in childhood. It sifts through our selective and self-censored memory as a myth and idyll of the way things ought to be, the lost paradise to be regained.

In his essay *On Memory and Childhood Amnesia*, Ernest Schachtel writes:

"Mankind's belief in a lost paradise is repeated in the belief held by most people in the individual myth of their happy childhood. Like most myths this one contains elements of both truth and illusion, is woven out of wishes, hopes, remembrance and sorrow, and hence has more than one meaning . . ."

The myth, he thinks, takes the place of the lost memory of the "actual riches, spontaneity, freshness of childhood experience." And he declares that "each genuine recovery of forgotten experience and, with it, something of the person that one was when having the experience carries with it an element of enrichment, adds to the light of consciousness, and thus widens the conscious scope of one's life". For childhood amnesia, Schachtel claims, covers those aspects and experiences of the former and forgotten personality which are incompatible with the culture in which we live.

"If they were remembered, man would demand that society affirm and accept the total personality with all its potentialities. In a society based on partial suppression of the personality such a demand, even the mere existence of a really free personality, would constitute a threat to the society."

★

PERHAPS it is this demand, strong and insistent in some, shrunken to vague wishes in others, which constitutes the 'ideal environment', the private dream behind our public acts, compounded as it is of myth and 'genuine recovery of forgotten experience'. The particular intensity with which people recall their childhood, even when their evocation bears little relation to reality, is one of the reasons why the first pages of autobiographies are more interesting than the last. Another is the relation of their picture of the home and family, with their view of society and all the human institutions which grow from the basic social unit. The American critic Lionel Trilling writes of the "great modern theme" of "the child's elemental emotions and familial trust being violated by the ideas and institutions of modern life", and he notes that:

"Haunted as we all are by unquiet dreams of peace and wholeness, we are eager and quick to find them embodied in another people. Other peoples may have for us the same beautiful integrity that, from childhood on, we are taught to find in some period of our national or ethnic pasts. Truth, we feel, must somewhere be embodied in man. Ever

another, one group of people or another, to satisfy our yearning . . . everyone searching for innocence, for simplicity and integrity of life."

You can scarcely open a conversation or a book, without running into somebody's private dream. Here, for instance in Orwell's glimpse-through-a-window at the 'perfect symmetry' of family life:

"Especially on winter evenings after tea, when the fire glows in the open range and dances mirrored in the steel fender, when Father, in shirtsleeves, sits in the rocking chair at one side of the fire, reading the racing finals, and Mother sits on the other with her sewing, and the children are happy with a pennorth of mint humbugs, and the dog lolls roasting himself on the rag mat."

Or here, from the much discussed *Not By Bread Alone*, is Dudintsev's private dream:

"In Galitski's home and family, everything was permeated by a particular kind of lovable simplicity which cannot be imitated or faked and therefore is not often met with. It was a family where there were many children, where everything was clean but lying about untidily, where the furniture was simple and inexpensive, and where generous helpings are served at table."

Often, of course, in the hierarchy of private dreams, domestic bliss is simply what you fall back on when all else fails. This dialogue with a leaving-age school-girl comes from the book *Crestwood Heights*:

Me: What do you want in life?

Jane: A million dollars.

Me: Is that all?

Jane: Oh well, to be famous, to make a contribution. . .

Me: What do you think you will get?

Jane: Marriage—children—an average family—an average amount of money.

★

A GOOD society, we may suppose, is one which makes possible, not necessarily the realisation of people's private dreams, for they are too various and mutually incompatible, but one which at least makes possible their formulation and some degree of approach towards them. When Edward Hyams speaks of the 'tiny minority' of people who are able to seek in adult life that ideal environment they have dreamed up for themselves as children, he is thinking of course, of the impossibility of thinking about the way you want to live when all your energy and ingenuity have to be devoted to keeping alive at all. "What have you got in your sandwich?" the Maresciallo in the film *Bread, Love and Dreams* asks one of the old men chewing a crust by the fountain. "Fantasies," he replies. For how many of the two and a half thousand million people in the world are private dreams possible?

But in a society like our own, with its 'expanding economy' and rising incomes, are we any nearer to our fifty million personal landscapes? Is our environment, our family life, the way we live, determined by anything more than sheer necessity, by social habits which may not reflect what we really want, by a paucity of available choices, or by accident? Sociologists of every description were never busier in analysing, tabulating and cataloguing our society. What can they tell us of the relation between the way we live and the way we would like to live?

In the next few weeks I would like to examine some of their recent studies from the point of view of these questions. C.W.

for the price of truth in the inevitable society, if there is some time, become possible to recognise truths, then what by shooting will without shooting. who have never strain and suffering conditions of the most only honest to re predict, in similar own reaction.

Looking back vices and treach communist govern authorities, and revolutionary for their tragedy. O Russians launche after they had br men into the co Command began Hungarians about tion of their tro three conditions: destroyed Red desecrated Russia

## Anar

IT was with ver anarchists wat gramme last weel the viewing public

We had an ad the programme w the announceme Times and asked they mean chaos confirmed when t a close-up of a

We felt better with Rita Milton, interviewer—so h and attractive, an and convincingly were not cut out interlude, for we pictures (lurid, ar bomb outrages ag ents of the 1890

Then over to a William Pickles, a School of Econon chism with faint p being plainly st when he mainta Mutual Aid dema potkin) had never a worm.

This piece of a was followed by with our comrade of his experience anarchist commu Unfortunately Al had not been a l any case was n For the interview demonstration of chism.

Then back to a at Hyde Park and bers of the crow sympathetic in spi Milton was told a ing and recording interviewed said t

Then a few fir from the interview Of the fifteen m lasted not more been allotted to



# Nineteen Days That Shook the Communists

ted." *The Nineteen* ban is a record of exactly thirty-nine pressed to the point e workers of Buda- er book, the naked successfully captured, nifestoes carefully ed of a possibly Although there is no at Petrograd, to add famous leaders, a a revolutionary sit- the legion of minor by the spontaneous

s are now familiar han repeat what is n, it might be use- ents after the space time, for example, mism among anar-

chists that the setting up of workers' councils and the peasants' spontaneous responsibility for supplying the towns with food might be the beginning of more far-reaching social changes. Particularly with the breakdown of the central authorities and the movement for regional autonomy. This regional autonomy, however, to quote *The Nineteen Days*, quickly became the nucleus of a rival government:—"Early in the morning of Wednesday, 31 October, the whole of Transdanubia came under the central authority of the Transdanubian National Council with its seat at Győr. It was a properly formed regional parliament, each of the National Councils of the affiliated countries being represented by four, and the affiliated cities by two, deputies. The outstanding feature of this rival authority was its working-class character, for it comprised, over and above the West Hungarian counties, the

National Council of Miskolc and the Workers' Council of Csepel Island in Budapest."

There was never any doubt, really, that had the revolution succeeded it would quickly have come under the influence of the Catholic church, a parliamentary system dominated by a coalition of Smallholders and Social Democrats, and perhaps a strong Socialist trade union movement. Internationally, the country's status might have been that of another neutral Finland. This is not to suggest that the revolution did not deserve the support and sympathy of all those who hoped for something more libertarian. What has happened since, the shootings and deportations, the forced confessions and the intimidation of intellectuals, are a grim reminder of the consequences of a rigid black-or-white interpretation of events.

There is, however, the question of violence and the degree to which even the most highly-principled pacifist could remain aloof from a struggle which was as much subjective as objective. Violence is the most extreme way of imposing authority or purpose, no matter the reasons, irrespective of issues of justice or injustice, and, like governments themselves, creates its own limitations and the certainty of ultimate defeat. To shoot at AVO Security Guards and Russian soldiers for various social and intellectual freedoms, better clothes and more food, means a willingness to buy them for the price of killing. If there is any truth in the inevitability of an anarchist society, if there is any hope of men, at some time, becoming sufficiently responsible to recognise certain fundamental truths, then whatever is achieved to-day by shooting will some day come about without shooting. For those, however, who have never known the personal strain and suffering of living under conditions of the most inhibiting kind, it is only honest to recognise that one cannot predict, in similar circumstances, one's own reaction.

Looking back at Budapest, the devices and treachery of the Gero Communist government and the Soviet authorities, and the gullibility of the revolutionary forces, stand out in all their tragedy. On the day before the Russians launched their second attack, after they had brought a further 250,000 men into the country, the Soviet High Command began discussions with the Hungarians about the promised evacuation of their troops. They made only three conditions: "The restoration of destroyed Red Army memorials and desecrated Russian cemeteries, a guaran-

tee that the resting place of Soviet soldiers would in future be respected by the Hungarians, and finally that the Soviet Army, when leaving Hungary, should be accorded full military honours." The following day, the troop dispositions satisfactorily completed, the attack began and the Hungarian representatives, like the Polish government that went to Moscow after the Second World War, were simply arrested.

Earlier, to illustrate how out of touch was the Gero government, a famous sports commentator made the following radio broadcast during the first days of the demonstrations:—"Our sports life stands on the threshold of gigantic tests (the Olympic Games). Would it not be a happy moment if the Hungarian flag were again hoisted on the Olympic mast at Melbourne?" He also asked that order be restored in case the international football match with Sweden on the following Sunday was affected.

The Nineteen Days proves satisfactorily that whether or not the attack on Egypt had been carried out by the British and the French, the Soviet High Command were already moving reinforcements into Hungary and had made all preparations for a second attack. When Nye Bevan, as he did after his recent talks with Khrushchev, maintains that the Russians reacted only when they felt that Suez meant the beginning of a third world war, he is simply denying the facts and showing that kind of readiness to be deceived that also afflicted the Hungarians.

At the end of *The Nineteen Days* is a section entitled Oldspeak-Newspeak in which there is a day-by-day comparison of radio broadcasts from both sides of the Iron Curtain. As eloquently as anything in this very valuable book, it illustrates the underlying lessons. For example, Radio Moscow, 5th November: "Initial reports from Hungary show that Kadar's programme has met with full support from the patriots of People's Hungary. At factories and mills, or just in the street, people are ardently discussing and approving it . . . Working-people everywhere are showing their sympathy and moral support for the Hungarian working-people who are upholding their just cause, their freedom and independence." While, on the same day, the Hungarian radio was crying: "Comrades, our place is on the barricades, where our Hungarian brothers are continuing the almost (hopeless?) struggle against brutal imperialism . . . Those who co-operate in any way and in the name of any party with the occupying colonial Power are traitors . . ." C.H.

## PEOPLE AND IDEAS

### A Million Private Dreams - I

that he was looking in his dreams that certain whether or in the real world. ights he called it the

GEORGE ORWELL.

ryone a mental and which is their own, ironment which they es as children. They eal scenery as much; that is, of course, which is able to a bare survival at a ception."

—EDWARD HYAMS.

purposive activities, and social arrange- commitments to the eologies, is the ideal -view' or 'life-style', quired in childhood. selective and self- in a lost paradise is belief held by most idual myth of their like most myths this ts of both truth and ut of wishes, hopes, rrow, and hence has ed.

Memory and Child- st Schachtel writes: in a lost paradise is belief held by most idual myth of their like most myths this ts of both truth and ut of wishes, hopes, rrow, and hence has ed.

anks, takes the place of the "actual riches, ss of childhood ex- declares that "each forgotten experience ng of the person that ing the experience ment of enrichment, e, an average amount of money.

since the nineteenth century, we have been fixing on one kind of person or another, one group of people or another, to satisfy our yearning . . . everyone searching for innocence, for simplicity and integrity of life."

You can scarcely open a conversation or a book, without running into somebody's private dream. Here, for instance in Orwell's glimpse-through-a-window at the 'perfect symmetry' of family life:

"Especially on winter evenings after tea, when the fire glows in the open range and dances mirrored in the steel fender, when Father, in shirtsleeves, sits in the rocking chair at one side of the fire, reading the racing finals, and Mother sits on the other with her sewing, and the children are happy with a pennorth of mint humbugs, and the dog lolls roasting himself on the rag mat."

Or here, from the much discussed *Not By Bread Alone*, is Dudintsev's private dream:

"In Galitski's home and family, everything was permeated by a particular kind of lovable simplicity which cannot be imitated or faked and therefore is not often met with. It was a family where there were many children, where everything was clean but lying about untidily, where the furniture was simple and inexpensive, and where generous helpings are served at table."

Often, of course, in the hierarchy of private dreams, domestic bliss is simply what you fall back on when all else fails. This dialogue with a leaving-age school-girl comes from the book *Crestwood Heights*:

Me: What do you want in life?

Jane: A million dollars.

Me: Is that all?

Jane: Oh well, to be famous, to make a contribution. . . .

Me: What do you think you will get?

Jane: Marriage—children—an average family, an average amount of money.

## Anarchists on Television

IT was with very mixed feelings that anarchists watched the television programme last week present anarchism to the viewing public.

We had an advance hint of the line the programme was going to take when the announcement appeared in *TV Times* and asked the question 'Or do they mean chaos?' and our fears were

tation of their ideas. The rest of the time was either superficial criticism—with no opportunity allowed for answering—or irrelevancies thrown in presumably to keep the programme well down to the mental level of the dullest viewer.

We had been assured by comrades that previous programmes in the 'Out of Step' series had been dealt with more



...it in the real world. ... he called it the ...

GEORGE ORWELL.

...everyone a mental and ... which is their own, ... environment which they ... as children. They ... scenery as much ... that is, of course, ... which is able to ... a bare survival at a ...ception."

—EDWARD HYAMS.

...purposive activities, ... and social arrange- ... commitments to the ... ideologies, is the ideal ...-view' or 'life-style', ...quired in childhood. ...selective and self- ... a myth and idyll ...ought to be, the lost ...ned.

...Memory and Child- ...est Schachtel writes: ...in a lost paradise is ... relief held by most ...idual myth of their ...Like most myths this ...ts of both truth and ...of wishes, hopes, ...orrow, and hence has ...ing ..."

...inks, takes the place ...of the "actual riches, ...ss of childhood ex- ...declares that "each ... forgotten experience ...ing of the person that ...iving the experience ...ement of enrichment, ...of consciousness, and ...sious scope of one's ...nd amnesia, Schachtel ...e aspects and exper- ...and forgotten per- ...compatible with the ...live.

...remembered, man would ...y affirm and accept ...y with all its poten- ...ety based on partial ...personality such a ...mere existence of a ...ity, would constitute ...ity."

...demand, strong and ...e, shrunken to vague ...which constitutes the ...the private dream ...acts, compounded as ...genuine recovery of ...e. The particular in- ...people recall their ...when their evocation ...to reality, is one of ...the first pages of auto- ...interesting than the ...the relation of their ...me and family, with ...ty and all the human ...grow from the basic ...merican critic Lionel ...the "great modern ...s elemental emotions ...being violated by the ...ns of modern life",

...all are by unquiet ...and wholeness, we are ...find them embodied ...Other peoples may ...ne beautiful integrity ...on, we are taught ...riod of our national ...truth, we feel, must ...odied in man. Ever

...another, one great people ...to satisfy our yearning ... everyone searching for innocence, for simplicity and integrity of life."

You can scarcely open a conversation or a book, without running into some- body's private dream. Here, for instance in Orwell's glimpse-through-a- window at the 'perfect symmetry' of family life:

"Especially on winter evenings after tea, when the fire glows in the open range and dances mirrored in the steel fender, when Father, in shirtsleeves, sits in the rocking chair at one side of the fire, reading the racing finals, and Mother sits on the other with her sewing, and the children are happy with a pennorth of mint humbugs, and the dog lolls roast- ing himself on the rag mat."

Or here, from the much discussed *Not By Bread Alone*, is Dudintsev's private dream:

"In Galitski's home and family, every- thing was permeated by a particular kind of lovable simplicity which cannot be imitated or faked and therefore is not often met with. It was a family where there were many children, where every- thing was clean but lying about untidily, where the furniture was simple and in- expensive, and where generous helpings are served at table."

Often, of course, in the hierarchy of private dreams, domestic bliss is simply what you fall back on when all else fails. This dialogue with a leaving-age school- girl comes from the book *Crestwood Heights*:

Me: What do you want in life?  
Jane: A million dollars.  
Me: Is that all?  
Jane: Oh well, to be famous, to make a contribution ...  
Me: What do you think you will get?  
Jane: Marriage—children—an average family—an average amount of money.

★

A GOOD society, we may suppose, is one which makes possible, not necessarily the realisation of people's private dreams, for they are too various and mutually incompatible, but one which at least makes possible their formulation and some degree of approach towards them. When Edward Hyams speaks of the 'tiny minority' of people who are able to seek in adult life that ideal environment they have dreamed up for themselves as children, he is think- ing of course, of the impossibility of thinking about the way you want to live when all your energy and ingenuity have to be devoted to keeping alive at all. "What have you got in your sandwich?" the Maresciallo in the film *Bread, Love and Dreams* asks one of the old men chewing a crust by the fountain. "Fan- tasies," re replies. For how many of the two and a half thousand million people in the world are private dreams possible?

But in a society like our own, with its 'expanding economy' and rising incomes, are we any nearer to our fifty million personal landscapes? Is our environment, our family life, the way we live, deter- mined by anything more than sheer necessity, by social habits which may not reflect what we really want, by a paucity of available choices, or by acci- dent? Sociologists of every description were never busier in analysing, tabulat- ing and cataloguing our society. What can they tell us of the relation between the way we live and the way we would like to live?

In the next few weeks I would like to examine some of their recent studies from the point of view of these questions. C.W.

truth in the inevitability of an anarchist society, if there is any hope of men, at some time, becoming sufficiently respon- sible to recognise certain fundamental truths, then whatever is achieved to-day by shooting will some day come about without shooting. For those, however, who have never known the personal strain and suffering of living under con- ditions of the most inhibiting kind, it is only honest to recognise that one cannot predict, in similar circumstances, one's own reaction.

Looking back at Budapest, the de- vices and treachery of the Gero Com- munist government and the Soviet authorities, and the gullibility of the revolutionary forces, stand out in all their tragedy. On the day before the Russians launched their second attack, after they had brought a further 250,000 men into the country, the Soviet High Command began discussions with the Hungarians about the promised evacua- tion of their troops. They made only three conditions: "The restoration of destroyed Red Army memorials and desecrated Russian cemeteries, a guaran-

## Anarchists on Television

IT was with very mixed feelings that anarchists watched the television pro- gramme last week present anarchism to the viewing public.

We had an advance hint of the line the programme was going to take when the announcement appeared in *TV Times* and asked the question 'Or do they mean chaos?' and our fears were confirmed when the telecast began with a close-up of a smoking bomb.

We felt better during the interview with Rita Milton, who had surprised the interviewer—so he said—by being young and attractive, and she presented clearly and convincingly those points which were not cut out. But this was a brief interlude, for we were soon shown old pictures (lurid, artists' reconstructions) of bomb outrages against Kings and Presi- dents of the 1890's.

Then over to an interview with a Mr. William Pickles, a product of the London School of Economics, who damned anar- chism with faint praise when he was not being plainly stupid—as, for example, when he maintained that Kropotkin's *Mutual Aid* demonstrated that he (Kro- potkin) had never seen a thrush devour a worm.

This piece of academic enlightenment was followed by a very brief interview with our comrade Alan Albon who spoke of his experience in *Communitas*, the anarchist community in the Cotswolds. Unfortunately Alan had to admit that it had not been a large community and in any case was no longer in existence. For the interviewer this was a clear demonstration of the failure of anar- chism.

Then back to a rather jumbled scene at Hyde Park and interviews with mem- bers of the crowd, none of whom were sympathetic in spite of the fact that Rita Milton was told at the time of the film- ing and recording that two of those interviewed said they were anarchists!

Then a few final, antagonistic words from the interviewer and that was that. Of the fifteen minutes the programme lasted not more than five could have been allotted to our comrades' presen-

Hungarians.

At the end of *The Nineteen Days* is a section entitled *Oldspeak-Newspeak* in which there is a day-by-day comparison of radio broadcasts from both sides of the Iron Curtain. As eloquently as any- thing in this very valuable book, it illus- trates the underlying lessons. For ex- ample, Radio Moscow, 5th November: "Initial reports from Hungary show that Kadar's programme has met with full support from the patriots of People's Hungary. At factories and mills, or just in the street, people are ardently discuss- ing and approving it ... Working-people everywhere are showing their sympathy and moral support for the Hungarian working-people who are upholding their just cause, their freedom and independ- ence." While, on the same day, the Hungarian radio was crying: "Comrades, our place is on the barricades, where our Hungarian brothers are continuing the almost (hopeless?) struggle against brutal imperialism ... Those who co-operate in any way and in the name of any party with the occupying colonial Power are traitors ..."

C.H.

tation of their ideas. The rest of the time was either superficial criticism—with no opportunity allowed for answer- ing—or irrelevancies thrown in presum- ably to keep the programme well down to the mental level of the dullest viewer.

We had been assured by comrades that previous programmes in the 'Out of Step' series had been dealt with more or less sympathetically. This was cer- tainly not the case with anarchism. Could it be that the producers of the programme saw nothing to be afraid of in nudism, scientology and flying saucers, and did not understand the social dynamite of A. S. Neill's work in education—but were scared of anarchism?

## So Much Was Cut

AFTER seeing the finished result of ITV's programme (October 16th, 'Out of Step'), which we had reason to believe would be treated more seriously, one doubts the wisdom of having col- laborated on a broadcast which could have added very little to the knowledge of viewers on anarchism.\*

A statement on anarchism made from our platform was entirely cut except for a discordant jumble of sounds largely contributed by a Conservative speaker who was theoretically conducting a dis- cussion with me.

The interview which took place off the platform, which included statements on war, the international aspect of anar- chism, Sacco & Vanzetti (specifically asked for), Communism and Christianity, was drastically cut.

The commentator's prejudiced remarks and the smoking bomb which introduced the programme indicated the impression it was hoped would be conveyed to the viewers.

As our milkman voluntarily remarked next morning: 'That man was against you from the start' and gallantly he added: 'tell me who he is and I'll do him'. One viewer who obviously was not taken it.

RITA MILTON.

\* And Alan Albon now has similar doubts on this also



# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 18, No. 43. October 26, 1957

## ENSURING HUNGER

“ONE part of the World has so much wheat that it does not know what to do with it while another has not as much food as would be good for it”. This is not a quotation from an anarchist criticism of the capitalist system, but the opening sentence from an editorial in the *Manchester Guardian* last week, commenting on the Canadian-American conference on economic matters at which, so far as we can see, agreements reached between the two governments over the disposal of surplus food products, will make it even more difficult for the hungry nations of the world to enjoy a few rotting scraps (it is said that much of the wheat surplus in the U.S. is unfit for human consumption; hungry people, however, are not fussy) from the bulging American larders.

Canada's objections to American methods for disposing of surplus wheat stocks was directed not so much to those transactions in which payment was made in local currencies, but to the large barter deals with England and Western Europe, the traditional and most important markets for Canadian wheat. The American government, which has repeatedly given a pledge that all surplus disposal activities would be conducted as far as possible without interfering with “normal commercial marketing” discovered, in examining Canadian objections, that the barter programme had in fact “got out of hand” and was interfering with normal commercial sales, that is American as well as Canadian! And some months ago the Department of Agriculture decided that each barter contract must result in a “net increase in exports of the agricultural commodity involved and that interest must be paid instead of relying on a simple letter of credit”.

“Until this conference”—writes Max Freedman, *Manchester Guardian* correspondent in New York—“this new rule, which has reduced trade under barter to marginal proportions, was no more than a rule sanctioned by Mr. Benson as Secretary of Agriculture. Now it is an assurance given publicly by the American Government as a whole to the Government in Ottawa.”

dian-American conference simply ironed out financial differences between the wheat marketing organisations of these two countries: what wheat the United States will not barter with England and Western Europe this coming year, Canada will presumably sell at market prices. And what will be knocked off Canada's surplus stocks will be correspondingly added to America's, while Asia's hungry millions will go on being hungry.

★

TO this problem of surpluses in a hungry world, the *Manchester Guardian* has little to offer, for

there is no early prospect of the heavily populated Asian countries having sufficient foreign currency available to buy much more wheat except when they are threatened with famine as a result of crop failures at home.

except to suggest that

From the producing countries' point of view, at least in the dollar area, there should be a much greater reduction in the acreage put down to wheat than the Canadian and American Governments have achieved so far.

What a blunt admission of personal failure as well as of a system, when intelligent and allegedly liberal men can be so blinded as to view a financial problem as more important to society than a human one! In other words, that it is more important to safeguard “normal commercial marketing”, (*which means maintaining prices by restricting production to what can be sold for cash plus a reserve to be held available in the event of crop failure in any of the wheat growing regions of the world—not on humanitarian grounds, but on the good business grounds that countries threatened with famine will pawn their future for a few sacks of wheat*) than to encourage more food production and to use the *Guardian's* influential editorial columns to launch an all-out attack on a system which possesses all the scientific knowledge and techniques for unlimited production but is incapable of organising distribution to satisfy real, human needs!

★

IF what the *Manchester Guardian* offers—and after all, it is only echoing what others advocate and what has been done in country after country—as a solution to the surplus problems of the wheat producing regions is the *practical* solution then the charge that anarchists are *impractical* is the highest compliment we can be paid by our critics!

What we impractical anarchists declare is that to-day, more than

## A LETTER TO

DEAR SOMEBODY,

Maybe you have picked up a copy of this paper for the first time and are no doubt wondering what it is all about. How can these people advocate the abolition of government? Why is it that they disagree with all political parties? Is it sheer contrariness? Or are they mad?—irresponsible?—neurotics with chips on their shoulders? These, and similar questions are perhaps troubling your mind. As one who has been possessed by this ‘madness’ for over ten years let me try to show you a few of the reasons why we anarchists see things the way we do.

Ever since the beginnings of civilisation man has been faced with two fundamentally different ways of ordering his life: the way of power and the way of freedom. In most cases he has chosen the first way, the way of power. The results are written plainly across the face of the earth. In every country there exists a division of people into two classes: the rulers and the ruled. From this division has sprung systems of society in which a small minority have dominated and exploited the majority. It does not matter which of the existing social systems you examine, in each of them you will find this division. Whether the government in question is democratic or autocratic, republican or monarchical, there is always a power-wielding élite on the one hand and a power-less mass on the other. Whether the economic structure is labelled capitalist, feudalist or socialist, there is a privileged group that obtains its wealth and pre-eminence out of the labour of others. Everywhere we see that the principle of power, the domination of man by man, is triumphant and has, in the shape of the modern totalitarian state, reached its logical and lunatic culmination. War, inequality, irresponsibility, increasing mental disease, are part of the warp and woof of our existence, are woven into the very texture of our lives.

“But hold on,” you may say, “surely you are being too dogmatic and one-sided? Is there not a great

difference between system, such as we and a dictatorship, or in Russia? Do we in the running of it, certainly, there are many with our system, but a different way of life, undemocratic East.”

There are differences in system of power in that which exists in differences are those of power, not It is true in this ample, that we choose the government we are allowed to ernment from am offer themselves as political office. Yet having a ‘say’ in ho run? Do we, the el the wars, compel taxes, order militar Most certainly not. the wars, pay the ta scripts, but we do will be fought, taxed. Although we are s ‘government by co sent is not asked re money we pay in whether we should allow ourselves or daughters to be co right to vote simply can select those wh —it does not mean ourselves. We can ters; we can dispe The relationship of government does no from that of him v one delegates his others; the other bility taken away

Power and freed patible. The free governed nor the g terminates his own li own choices. The the anarchist advoc of each against all, pillage and bloods opponents often say is the voluntary sovereign individual basic human need and knowledge. It some higher power, evitable result of process. Freedom from the depths o created in our rel fellows. We do no a Second Coming o Revolution in orde come free; we can from being a boss man to being a fr now. Each time v selves, act direct

the worst things that Man does against himself would not be possible without a feeling of co-operation and loyalty among men (wars are fought between men, yes; but wars would be unthinkable without a deep feeling of solidarity among large groups of men, and loyalty to values, however misplaced, on both sides of no-man's land). It is equally an indisputable fact that the giants, the human élite if you will, who have most contributed to Man's know-



American larders.

Canada's objections to American methods for disposing of surplus wheat stocks was directed not so much to those transactions in which payment was made in local currencies, but to the large barter deals with England and Western Europe, the traditional and most important markets for Canadian wheat. The American government, which has repeatedly given a pledge that all surplus disposal activities would be conducted as far as possible without interfering with "normal commercial marketing" discovered, in examining Canadian objections, that the barter programme had in fact "got out of hand" and was interfering with normal commercial sales, that is American as well as Canadian! And some months ago the Department of Agriculture decided that each barter contract must result in a "net increase in exports of the agricultural commodity involved and that interest must be paid instead of relying on a simple letter of credit".

"Until this conference"—writes Max Freedman, *Manchester Guardian* correspondent in New York—"this new rule, which has reduced trade under barter to marginal proportions, was no more than a rule sanctioned by Mr. Benson as Secretary of Agriculture. Now it is an assurance given publicly by the American Government as a whole to the Government in Ottawa."

And he adds that

American officials welcomed Canada's protests against barter, since it strengthened their hand against any repeal or revision of the new rule. Three American groups wanted an enlarged barter programme: the grain companies which had found the old system very profitable; the American Farm Bureau which had reversed its earlier policy and now sought a return to barter but on a smaller scale; and the mineral people, with their interests in a large strategic stockpile.

Presumably the Government is against a repeal of the new rule because other, politically and financially more powerful, interests are opposed to the barter scheme.

Max Freedman concludes that "after this conference it will be much more difficult for barter operations to be resumed in their old form", and this he considers "a victory which may properly be regarded as valuable, timely, and encouraging" though he does not explain on what grounds it can be thus considered, and the more so since he declares that not only does no one pretend "that all anxiety about American farm policy has been removed" but that so far as Canada is concerned not much progress has in fact been made "in solving her own huge surplus problem".

Obviously the surplus problems are not solved by settling squabbles over existing markets. The Cana-

a financial problem as more important to society than a human one! In other words, that it is more important to safeguard "normal commercial marketing", (*which means maintaining prices by restricting production to what can be sold for cash plus a reserve to be held available in the event of crop failure in any of the wheat growing regions of the world—not on humanitarian grounds, but on the good business grounds that countries threatened with famine will pawn their future for a few sacks of wheat*) than to encourage more food production and to use the *Guardian's* influential editorial columns to launch an all-out attack on a system which possesses all the scientific knowledge and techniques for unlimited production but is incapable of organising distribution to satisfy real, human needs!

★

IF what the *Manchester Guardian* offers—and after all, it is only echoing what others advocate and what has been done in country after country—as a solution to the surplus problems of the wheat producing regions is the *practical* solution then the charge that anarchists are *impractical* is the highest compliment we can be paid by our critics!

What we impractical anarchists declare is that to-day, more than ever before in Man's long history, the growth of scientific knowledge, and its application to production techniques, to the development of communications; the ever-growing inter-dependability between peoples for the raw materials of our material—as well as cultural—civilisation, make the maintenance of geographical, political and economic frontiers not only a ridiculous anachronism but a tragedy which in the present century alone has cost hundreds of millions of lives, untold misery, frustration and wasted human energy.

Whereas on the one hand scientific knowledge has been instrumental in prolonging life, in expanding Man's potentialities for a richer material and cultural life—by contracting the distances which separated man from man and from the natural sources of potential wealth—on the other, a minority of men have contrived to turn to their personal advantage that which obviously belongs to all mankind. But we are expected to accept this latter state of affairs as normal. By some, as a kind of pre-ordained law of human nature, by others, the "successful" cynics, politicians and business men, as the price we have to pay for a tooth-and-claw, rough-and-tumble "Darwinian struggle of the fittest" pattern of society.

This kind of argument seems to be generally accepted without question, in spite of the fact that even

and this division. Whether the government in question is democratic or autocratic, republican or monarchical, there is always a power-wielding élite on the one hand and a power-less mass on the other. Whether the economic structure is labelled capitalist, feudalist or socialist, there is a privileged group that obtains its wealth and pre-eminence out of the labour of others. Everywhere we see that the principle of power, the domination of man by man, is triumphant and has, in the shape of the modern totalitarian state, reached its logical and lunatic culmination. War, inequality, irresponsibility, increasing mental disease, are part of the warp and woof of our existence, are woven into the very texture of our lives.

"But hold on," you may say, "surely you are being too dogmatic and one-sided? Is there not a great

the worst things that Man does against himself would not be possible without a feeling of co-operation and loyalty among men (wars are fought between men, yes; but wars would be unthinkable without a deep feeling of solidarity among large groups of men, and loyalty to values, however misplaced, on both sides of no-man's land). It is equally an indisputable fact that the giants, the human élite if you will, who have most contributed to Man's knowledge of himself, to his cultural development, as well as over his physical environment, have rarely been at the same time the oppressors of their fellow-beings, the advocates of special privileges and Power by reason of their exceptional intellectual gifts. And what of the toiling millions who have actually produced the material wealth which has maintained life (more or less) for the world's growing millions? Why have they, in spite of their vital rôle as producers, always been the under-privileged of our society?

★

EXPLOITATION and the oppression of man by man has, it is true, gone on for a long time. It is no reason, however, for assuming that this is the "natural order of things" or an inevitable aspect of human society. Any more than in the question of food surpluses considerations of Finance should override the needs of a thousand million hungry fellow humans. But these artificial, minority, interests obviously will decide for us until enough people have the courage and the sense of responsibility necessary to be not *practical* (which has in any case been deformed to mean *expedient* or simply *dishonest*) but *human*. When this happens there will be no food surpluses rotting in warehouses and Liberty ships, nor will one half of mankind be wasting away through hunger and neglect.

daughters to be allowed ourselves right to vote simply can select those who—it does not mean ourselves. We can'ters; we can dispThe relationship of government does not from that of him one delegates his others; the other bility taken away f

Power and freedom are not compatible. The free governed nor the termines his own li own choices. The the anarchist advoc of each against all, pillage and blood opponents often sa is the voluntary sovereign individual basic human need and knowledge. It some higher power inevitable result of process. Freedom from the depths created in our re fellows. We do not a Second Coming Revolution in order come free; we can from being a boss man to being a fr now. Each time v selves, act directly lem which confront operate freely with instead of trying to allowing them to making ourselves and contributing t all.

Dear Somebody that what I have

## FREEDOM

### VOLINE :

*Nineteen-Seventy  
Revolution Bet  
The Unknown  
(Kronstadt 1921)*

### E. A. GUTKIND

*The Expanding*

### JOHN HEWETTS

*Ill-Health, Pov  
clo*

### ERRICO MALATESTA

*Anarchy*

*Vote—What Fe*

### M. BAKUNIN :

*Marxism, Free*

### PETER KROPOTKIN

*The State: Its*

*The Wage Syst*

*Revolutionary*

*Organised Veng*

### TONY GIBSON

*Youth for Rev*

*Food Production*

*Who will do th*



# A LETTER TO SOMEBODY

DEAR SOMEBODY,

Maybe you have picked up a copy of this paper for the first time and are no doubt wondering what it is all about. How can these people advocate the abolition of government? Why is it that they disagree with all political parties? Is it sheer contrariness? Or are they mad?—irresponsible?—neurotics with chips on their shoulders? These, and similar questions are perhaps troubling your mind. As one who has been possessed by this 'madness' for over ten years let me try to show you a few of the reasons why we anarchists see things the way we do.

Ever since the beginnings of civilisation man has been faced with two fundamentally different ways of ordering his life: the way of power and the way of freedom. In most cases he has chosen the first way, the way of power. The results are written plainly across the face of the earth. In every country there exists a division of people into two classes: the rulers and the ruled. From this division has sprung systems of society in which a small minority have dominated and exploited the majority. It does not matter which of the existing social systems you examine, in each of them you will find this division. Whether the government in question is democratic or autocratic, republican or monarchical, there is always a power-wielding élite on the one hand and a power-less mass on the other. Whether the economic structure is labelled capitalist, feudalist or socialist, there is a privileged group that obtains its wealth and pre-eminence out of the labour of others. Everywhere we see that the principle of power, the domination of man by man, is triumphant and has, in the shape of the modern totalitarian state, reached its logical and lunatic culmination. War, inequality, irresponsibility, increasing mental disease, are part of the warp and woof of our existence, are woven into the very texture of our lives.

"But hold on," you may say, "surely you are being too dogmatic and one-sided? Is there not a great

difference between a democratic system, such as we have in Britain, and a dictatorship, such as they have in Russia? Do we not have a say in the running of our lives? Certainly, there are many things wrong with our system, but it is quite a different way of life to that of the undemocratic East."

There are differences between the system of power in this country and that which exists in Russia, but the differences are those of the 'accidents' of power, not of its 'essence'. It is true in this country, for example, that we are allowed to choose the government, or, rather, we are allowed to choose the government from among those who offer themselves as candidates for political office. Yet, is this really having a 'say' in how our lives are run? Do we, the electorate, declare the wars, compel the collection of taxes, order military conscription? Most certainly not. We have to fight the wars, pay the taxes, be the conscripts, but we do not decide who will be fought, taxed or conscripted. Although we are supposed to have 'government by consent', our consent is not asked regarding how the money we pay in taxes is spent, whether we should go to war, or allow ourselves or our sons and daughters to be conscripted. The right to vote simply means that we can select those who will govern us—it does not mean that we govern ourselves. We can choose our masters; we can dispense with them. The relationship of the voter to 'his' government does not basically differ from that of him who is voteless: one delegates his responsibility to others; the other has his responsibility taken away from him.

Power and freedom are incompatible. The free man is neither governed nor the governor. He determines his own life and makes his own choices. The freedom which the anarchist advocates is not a war of each against all, an orgy of rape, pillage and bloodshed which our opponents often say it is. Freedom is the voluntary co-operation of sovereign individuals to satisfy the basic human needs of love, work and knowledge. It is not a gift from some higher power, nor is it the inevitable result of some historical process. Freedom has to be won from the depths of our souls and created in our relations with our fellows. We do not have to wait for a Second Coming or the Day of the Revolution in order to begin to become free; we can start the change from being a boss-man or a mass-man to being a free man here and now. Each time we think for ourselves, act directly to solve a prob-

vinced you of the truth of our case. Indeed, I would be very surprised if it had, since the change from power-thinking to freedom-thinking is not an easy one. But at least I hope I have written enough to show you that our 'madness' is not that of the mental hospital. I will finish my letter with one final remark. It is this: In the course of his history man has tried every conceivable form of government. He has tried Christian governments, atheist governments, Mohammedan governments, conservative governments, socialist governments, communist governments, liberal governments, social credit governments, prohibition governments and, for all I know, flat-earth governments. Whatever type of government he has tried, however, the tragic circle of violence, exploitation, and frustration has continued. Whatever love and knowledge he has achieved has been *in spite* of governments, not *because* of them. Is it not time to consider that the failure of governments to end this tragic circle is not due to their personnel or their ideology, but to their *very nature*, to the fact that they are power institutions? We anarchists believe that all persons are potentially capable of living together without power; that, in fact, we can only live in a fully dignified, creative, *human* way, when the pattern of domination and submission which is power has been replaced by the pattern of freedom and responsibility which is anarchy. Why not think it over and see if you agree with us?

S. E. PARKER.

## Nudism Banned in Arkansas

THE State of Arkansas appears to be determined to make its name synonymous with reaction. While world-wide attention is rivetted upon the desegregation struggle at Little Rock High School, Governor Faubus is not idle in other directions.

The British Sun-Bathing Association provides us with the following information:

'From Arkansas—already too much in the sun—there comes news of a piece of intolerance which, if less harsh, is even more sinister and capable of exploitation.

'A Bill to prohibit nudism has been passed by both Houses of the Legislature and signed by the much-discussed Governor Faubus. It is understood to have been inspired by the Rev. Mr. Baxton Sawyer, who has been foiled in recent years in his attempt to outlaw nudity in Kansas, Oklahoma, Michigan and Missouri.

The effect of the Act is completely to

ference simply  
al differences be-  
marketing organisa-  
countries: what  
States will not  
and Western  
ng year, Canada  
at market prices.  
knocked off Cana-  
s will be corres-  
America's, while  
tions will go on

of surpluses in a  
the *Manchester*  
to offer, for

prospect of the  
ian countries hav-  
currency available  
wheat except when  
with famine as a  
s at home.

at  
ng countries' point  
e dollar area, there  
greater reduction in  
to wheat than the  
rican Governments

admission of per-  
ll as of a system,  
d allegedly libe-  
blinded as to view  
as more impor-  
a human one!  
at it is more im-  
rd "normal com-  
, (which means  
s by restricting  
can be sold for  
to be held avail-  
of crop failure in  
rowing regions of  
on humanitarian  
he good business  
tries threatened  
own their future  
f wheat) than to  
d production and  
dian's influential  
to launch an all-  
stem which pos-  
scientific knowledge  
unlimited produc-  
ble of organising  
sify real, human

chester *Guardian*  
er all, it is only  
ers advocate and  
e in country after  
ion to the surplus  
wheat producing  
ical solution then  
archists are im-  
hest compliment  
our critics!  
etical anarchists  
-day, more than

the worst things that Man does against himself would not be possible without a feeling of co-operation and loyalty among men (wars are fought between men, yes; but wars would be unthinkable without a deep feeling of solidarity among large groups of men, and loyalty to values, however misplaced, on both sides of no-man's land). It is equally an indisputable fact that the giants, the human élite if you will, who have most contributed to Man's know-



as more important than a human one! It is more important than "normal commodity", (which means by restricting it can be sold for more than its value) than to be held available for crop failure in growing regions of human humanitarianism. The good business of countries threatened by war (wheat) than to produce and production and production's influential to launch an all-out effort which possible knowledge unlimited production of organising satisfy real, human

chester Guardian. In all, it is only in the country after the surplus wheat producing solution then anarchists are im- the highest compliment to our critics! Practical anarchists today, more than man's long history, scientific knowledge, to production development of the ever-growing between peoples of our material—civilisation, of geographi- economic frontiers of anachronism in the present cost hundreds of untold misery, wasted human

one hand scientific been instrumental in expanding for a richer life—by con- which separa- and from the potential wealth— of men have to their personal which obviously be- ind. But we are at this latter state. By some, as a ed law of human the "successful" and business men, ave to pay for a rough-and-tumble le of the fittest" argument seems to ed without ques- the fact that even

find this division. Whether the government in question is democratic or autocratic, republican or monarchical, there is always a power-wielding élite on the one hand and a power-less mass on the other. Whether the economic structure is labelled capitalist, feudalist or socialist, there is a privileged group that obtains its wealth and pre-eminence out of the labour of others. Everywhere we see that the principle of power, the domination of man by man, is triumphant and has, in the shape of the modern totalitarian state, reached its logical and lunatic culmination. War, inequality, irresponsibility, increasing mental disease, are part of the warp and woof of our existence, are woven into the very texture of our lives.

"But hold on," you may say, "surely you are being too dogmatic and one-sided? Is there not a great

the worst things that Man does against himself would not be possible without a feeling of co-operation and loyalty among men (wars are fought between men, yes; but wars would be unthinkable without a deep feeling of solidarity among large groups of men, and loyalty to values, however misplaced, on both sides of no-man's land). It is equally an indisputable fact that the giants, the human élite if you will, who have most contributed to Man's knowledge of himself, to his cultural development, as well as over his physical environment, have rarely been at the same time the oppressors of their fellow-beings, the advocates of special privileges and Power by reason of their exceptional intellectual gifts. And what of the toiling millions who have actually produced the material wealth which has maintained life (more or less) for the world's growing millions? Why have they, in spite of their vital rôle as producers, always been the under-privileged of our society?

★

**EXPLOITATION** and the oppression of man by man has, it is true, gone on for a long time. It is no reason, however, for assuming that this is the "natural order of things" or an inevitable aspect of human society. Any more than in the question of food surpluses considerations of Finance should override the needs of a thousand million hungry fellow humans. But these artificial, minority, interests obviously will decide for us until enough people have the courage and the sense of responsibility necessary to be not *practical* (which has in any case been deformed to mean *expedient* or simply *dishonest*) but *human*. When this happens there will be no food surpluses rotting in warehouses and Liberty ships, nor will one half of mankind be wasting away through hunger and neglect.

whether we should go to war, or allow ourselves or our sons and daughters to be conscripted. The right to vote simply means that we can select those who will govern us—it does not mean that we govern ourselves. We can choose our masters; we can dispense with them. The relationship of the voter to 'his' government does not basically differ from that of him who is voteless: one delegates his responsibility to others; the other has his responsibility taken away from him.

Power and freedom are incompatible. The free man is neither governed nor the governor. He determines his own life and makes his own choices. The freedom which the anarchist advocates is not a war of each against all, an orgy of rape, pillage and bloodshed which our opponents often say it is. Freedom is the voluntary co-operation of sovereign individuals to satisfy the basic human needs of love, work and knowledge. It is not a gift from some higher power, nor is it the inevitable result of some historical process. Freedom has to be won from the depths of our souls and created in our relations with our fellows. We do not have to wait for a Second Coming or the Day of the Revolution in order to begin to become free; we can start the change from being a boss-man or a mass-man to being a free man here and now. Each time we think for ourselves, act directly to solve a problem which confronts us, seek to co-operate freely with our fellows instead of trying to coerce them or allowing them to coerce us, we are making ourselves into free persons and contributing to the freedom of all.

Dear Somebody, I do not expect that what I have written has con-

gether without power: that, in fact, we can only live in a fully dignified, creative, *human* way, when the pattern of domination and submission which is power has been replaced by the pattern of freedom and responsibility which is anarchy. Why not think it over and see if you agree with us?

S. E. PARKER.

## Nudism Banned in Arkansas

THE State of Arkansas appears to be determined to make its name synonymous with reaction. While worldwide attention is rivetted upon the desegregation struggle at Little Rock High School, Governor Faubus is not idle in other directions.

The British Sun-Bathing Association provides us with the following information:

'From Arkansas—already too much in the sun—there comes news of a piece of intolerance which, if less harsh, is even more sinister and capable of exploitation.

'A Bill to prohibit nudism has been passed by both Houses of the Legislature and signed by the much-discussed Governor Faubus. It is understood to have been inspired by the Rev. Mr. Baxton Sawyer, who has been foiled in recent years in his attempt to outlaw nudity in Kansas, Oklahoma, Michigan and Missouri.

'The effect of the Act is completely to prohibit social nudity as a danger to "the public peace, health, welfare, safety and morals". But what is more extraordinary and far-reaching is that it is now unlawful "to advocate, demonstrate or promote nudism".

'Not only is action prohibited; opinion itself is stifled.'

HAROLD COLLINS,

Press Relations Officer, BSBA.

## FREEDOM PRESS

### VOLINE :

*Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed)* cloth 12s. 6d.  
*The Unknown Revolution*  
(Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21)  
cloth 12s. 6d.

### E. A. GUTKIND :

*The Expanding Environment* 8s. 6d.  
**JOHN HEWETSON :**  
*Ill-Health, Poverty and the State*  
cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.

### ERRICO MALATESTA :

*Anarchy* 6d.  
*Vote—What For?* 1d.

### M. BAKUNIN :

*Marxism, Freedom and the State.*  
cloth 5s.

### PETER KROPOTKIN :

*The State: Its Historic Rôle* 1s.  
*The Wage System* 3d.  
*Revolutionary Government* 3d.  
*Organised Vengeance Called Justice*

### TONY GIBSON :

*Youth for Freedom* paper 2s.  
*Food Production and Population* 6d.  
*Who will do the Dirty Work?* 2d.

### GEORGE WOODCOCK :

*New Life to the Land* 6d.  
*Homes or Hovels?* 6d.  
*Railways and Society* 3d.  
*What is Anarchism?* 1d.  
*The Basis of Communal Living* 1s.

### MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI :

*Neither East nor West*  
paper 7s. 6d.; cloth 10s. 6d.

### HERBERT READ :

*Art and the Evolution of Man* 4s.  
*Existentialism, Marxism and Anarchism* 3s. 6d.  
*Poetry and Anarchism*  
cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d.  
*The Philosophy of Anarchism*  
boards 2s. 6d., paper 1s.  
*The Education of Free Men* 1s. 2d.

★

### F. A. RIDLEY :

*The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age* 2d.

### K. J. KENAFICK :

*Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx*  
paper 6s.

**27, Red Lion Street,  
London, W.C.1.**



IN his letter last week, P.H. raises "the question of the relation between anarchism and non-anarchist progressive attitudes", and the value of "trying to become really clear about what we want, what we are prepared to accept, and how we can get it". What does one do, he asks, when faced with well-meaning people, who are verbally enthusiastic about all the things that interest us, who use all the O.K. phrases, but who "when brought down to specific issues have the same attitudes to the vital matters of power, authority and freedom as have generals and public school headmasters"? His question and his examples touch very closely upon my own dilemma which is, I think the dilemma of every anarchist who wants to relate his view of life to the world he lives in.

What does it mean to be an anarchist? Let us take five anarchists, A, B, C, D, and E, to represent five types of answer to this question.

A. is steeped in the teachings of the classical anarchist and socialist thinkers. He calls his associates 'comrade' and his language and exhortations are those current in the revolutionary movements of fifty years ago. For him there are no compromises and no short cuts.

B. is an out-and-outer of a different sort, rather like our friend Ammon Hennacy in America. He pays no taxes and arranges his life to avoid any compromises with the state. He is a tireless propagandist who 'lives out' his anarchism.

## Briefs from the Press

### Anarchism Defined

Libertarian Socialism had its origin in anarchism, and the anarchist way is "Do it yourself if you can." The advantage of anarchism is that who wants can practise it if left alone. There is no compulsion; if there were it would not be anarchism.

—Lord Amwell in a letter to "Daily Telegraph" (9/10/57).

### Agent Provocateur

In the *News of the World* the other day there was a report of two alleged cases of indecent assault. The assaults were alleged to have taken place on succeeding days, at the same place, and upon the same man, who was, I need hardly add, a policeman. It is, of course, possible that the policeman was just very unlucky, but it is much more likely that his job was to act as an *agent provocateur* and that he was successful—except that both men were acquitted.

—*The Spectator* (18/10/57).

### How He Got It

All this week press and radio have been telling us that Lord Nuffield has, in the course of his life, donated twenty-odd millions to charity. Is this not wrongly put? Surely the money has been donated by Lord Nuffield's employ-

C. is a communitarian. He wants to put his anarchism into practice in community experiments which are to be both his personal answer to the question *How Shall I Live?* and a beacon light to others.

D. is an empirical toughie. He doesn't have a conscience about all those compromises; he asserts his right to pick and choose which he shall make. At the same time he hasn't any illusions about existing institutions. They're none of them any good.

E. is an empirical softie. He makes every possible compromise with the society around us, but since anarchism seeks to replace government and authority as a means of social organisation, by a network of voluntary non-coercive association, he looks for examples of this principle of organisation in existing society and tries to strengthen them and enlarge their scope.

These five types do not exhaust the range of anarchist attitudes, and anarchists being as inconsistent and changeable as anybody else, many of us vacillate between several of them. Who can

THE recent remarks by C.W. (*People and Ideas* 12/10/57) about the impudence of the Ministry of Education's machinery for closing down "objectionable" independent schools, are given added point by a letter published in the *Times Educational Supplement* from the headmaster of an independent school, with experience of a wide variety of local education authority schools, who writes:

"The school of which I have the privilege to be the headmaster exists because of the profound dissatisfaction of the parents of my pupils with the schools provided by the Minister, often on all of these very grounds, and as often on much more serious grounds, which boils down to the fact that the Minister, through his educational system, accepts and condones patterns of treatment of children to which these parents, thoughtful citizens of this country, are very-unwilling indeed to subject their own well-loved and cared-for children. As a result, while continuing to pay taxes to finance these State schools which they regard as seriously unsatisfactory, they also spend considerable sums of hard-earned money each year on paying for the existence of a school of their own which, although it struggles permanently against financial difficulties and suffers from many inadequacies of which we are all too acutely aware, they yet regard as more nearly fulfilling their concept of the kind of education they desire for their children.

## LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

# The Tender Trap

say that A. is wrong. The more you look at the world to-day, the more you feel the need for revolution, however quaint or apocalyptic it sounds in British or American ears. Is B. wrong, or 'unrealistic' as the clever-dicks would have it? It seems to me that Danilo Dolci or Vinoba Bhave are a good deal more realistic than those who dismiss them with a smile. Is C. wrong? Criticism of him seems to be a matter of sour grapes if he succeeds, or 'I told you so' if he fails. Is D. wrong? Who has the right to expect him to be a saint? Is E. wrong? I am too close to him to say. Certainly he runs the risk of whittling down his anarchism to a kind of National Council of Social Service attitude, but at the same time he is affirming precisely that difference between anarchism and "non-anarchist progressive attitudes" that P.H. mentioned in his letter.

The point is well-made by Geoffrey Ostergaard in the new issue of the *University Libertarian*, when he declares that:

"The task of the anarchist is not however, to dream about the future society; rather it is to act as anarchistically as he can within the present society; to avoid

as far as possible is commanded or demanded; and to enditions of mutual andtion between his f achieve anarchy, th pensed with; and with to the exten capable of living v

The progressive political action, the by-pass it, the prog of voluntary associ sible adjunct to th ernment, the anar grow out of that ro sibility and auton in attitude was ill programme to-nigh very subject that s —parent-teacher as Henriques, in expla such associations, no part of their b the functions of th or managers. The hand must affirm what these associat that it is exactly anarchists should London.

## Independent Schools

schools come much nearer to satisfying us, he will not dare to describe as 'objectionable' the school we have created at sore cost to ourselves, however much it may fail to conform to his regulations and standards? Especially as there are very many ways in which we hope it will never conform to his regulations and standards!"

Another question which might be asked of the Minister and his inspectors is how many of the State's schools meet the Ministry's own statutory requirements. How many of the school buildings condemned in the famous 1925 Black List of the Board of Education are still in use? How many classes in both primary and secondary schools are larger than the Ministry's regulations allow. Does he propose to close down what a recent writer described as the "shabby educational slums" which exist in many rural districts?

The Minister of Education, who draws a salary of £5,500 a year for doing less than nothing, ought to find time to answer some of these questions before

sitting in judgment on schools, the worst of be worse than the w Bucks.

### Vladimir

ON what evidence isolated reports (at its last ga stakes) does FREEDOMir Dudintsev, the *Bread Alone*, has d Priestley went on a Isle of Wight, woul appearance? Since ment can render very easily by den what purpose wou serve, now that the finds slave labour book has, contrary tions, been publish edition of 30,000 *Pisatvel*, 7.50 rouble disappearance seem of it. Lodon.

## 'A Subtle Sense of the

DEAR SIR,

Reviews of art exhibitions in FREEDOM are usually so much more stimulating and expressive of a different viewpoint from other papers—why so few? A pity really for it means some important shows get passed over and a few second-

for nothing more, i easy to think so, f compared with the more (who might b wrong in his ideas) him less honest. A truth in the statem



## Briefs from the Press

### Anarchism Defined

Libertarian Socialism had its origin in anarchism, and the anarchist way is "Do it yourself if you can." The advantage of anarchism is that who wants can practise it if left alone. There is no compulsion; if there were it would not be anarchism.

—Lord Amwell in a letter to "Daily Telegraph" (9/10/57).

### Agent Provocateur

In the *News of the World* the other day there was a report of two alleged cases of indecent assault. The assaults were alleged to have taken place on succeeding days, at the same place, and upon the same man, who was, I need hardly add, a policeman. It is, of course, possible that the policeman was just very unlucky, but it is much more likely that his job was to act as an *agent provocateur* and that he was successful—except that both men were acquitted.

—*The Spectator* (18/10/57).

### How He Got It

All this week press and radio have been telling us that Lord Nuffield has, in the course of his life, donated twenty-odd millions to charity. Is this not wrongly put? Surely the money has been donated by Lord Nuffield's employees and customers, from whom it was extracted by wages evidently lower, or prices higher, than necessary.

—*Letter to "New Statesman"* (19/10/57).

### City Life

Here is a world not specifically Italian. All Western Europe and most of the United States now have big numbers of such human parasites in their cities.

From these books it would be easy to surmise that there is something badly wrong with the whole of Italian society. But the material in these books will be used by more detached students, as time goes on, for a more general study of how sections of big city populations in our day, not only in Rome, appear to be the prey of overwhelming social, political, and artistic frustration.

—*Review of two books on the Montesi Case in "Manchester Guardian"* (18/10/57).

## Now Ready!

### SELECTIONS FROM "FREEDOM"

Volume 6, 1956

### OIL AND TROUBLED WATERS

312 pages paper 7/6, Cloth 10/6\*

The paper edition of the Selections is available to readers of *FREEDOM* at 5/- a copy

THE recent remarks by C.W. (*People and Ideas* 12/10/57) about the impudence of the Ministry of Education's machinery for closing down "objectionable" independent schools, are given added point by a letter published in the *Times Educational Supplement* from the headmaster of an independent school, with experience of a wide variety of local education authority schools, who writes:

"The school of which I have the privilege to be the headmaster exists because of the profound dissatisfaction of the parents of my pupils with the schools provided by the Minister, often on all of these very grounds, and as often on much more serious grounds, which boils down to the fact that the Minister, through his educational system, accepts and condones patterns of treatment of children to which these parents, thoughtful citizens of this country, are very-unwilling indeed to subject their own well-loved and cared-for children. As a result, while continuing to pay taxes to finance these State schools which they regard as seriously unsatisfactory, they also spend considerable sums of hard-earned money each year on paying for the existence of a school of their own which, although it struggles permanently against financial difficulties and suffers from many inadequacies of which we are all too acutely aware, they yet regard as more nearly fulfilling their concept of the kind of education they desire for their children.

"Much of what the Minister appears to regard as 'efficient and suitable instruction'—to judge by our own not inconsiderable experience of his schools—we regard with horror, and wish to protect our children from it and to provide them with what we regard as much better fare; so our educational patterns and methods are, of deliberate choice, considerably different from those which he endorses. Some of my teaching staff, hand-picked for the work here, possess no paper qualifications at all. But they do possess other qualifications which we prize very highly and which are all too often sadly lacking in the staff-rooms of the State's schools. There are hundreds upon hundreds of teachers in the Minister's employment whom I would never dream of allowing near my pupils and who could never achieve the standards we set ourselves—yet they are regarded as 'efficient and suitable' by the Minister.

"Nor would we expect his inspectors—people who have proved themselves so thoroughly 'efficient and suitable' inside the Minister's educational system that they have been given posts of special responsibility for its maintenance—to understand or approve of our ways. "May we have an assurance from the Minister that until such time as his own

### 'The Awkward Question'

THE reprint of the article by Colin Ward with the above title has been circulated to those readers who ordered quantities. (As a result of the suggestion for a reprint in *FREEDOM* 24/8/57).

There are a few hundred of these leaflets still available. They may be obtained from Freedom Press for 2s. per 100.

schools come much nearer to satisfying us, he will not dare to describe as 'objectionable' the school we have created at sore cost to ourselves, however much it may fail to conform to his regulations and standards? Especially as there are very many ways in which we hope it will never conform to his regulations and standards!"

Another question which might be asked of the Minister and his inspectors is how many of the State's schools meet the Ministry's own statutory requirements. How many of the school buildings condemned in the famous 1925 Black List of the Board of Education are still in use? How many classes in both primary and secondary schools are larger than the Ministry's regulations allow. Does he propose to close down what a recent writer described as the "shabby educational slums" which exist in many rural districts?

The Minister of Education, who draws a salary of £5,500 a year for doing less than nothing, ought to find time to answer some of these questions before

## 'A Subtle Sense of the

DEAR SIR,

Reviews of art exhibitions in *FREEDOM* are usually so much more stimulating and expressive of a different viewpoint from other papers—why so few? A pity really for it means some important shows get passed over and a few second-rate ones get a decent write-up. Thinking over last week's article I am not at all sure that D.R. would agree with this statement. A few remarks in the opening paragraphs on the "usefulness" of pictures have me a little worried. The purpose of painting as I see it is to communicate, or express oneself, through plastic means to others, as is done with words or music—if this is so, then surely we should expect more than a decorative wall panel from manipulators of paint. Is honesty such a prerogative of the decorative painter? If he tries

### SKIFFLE AT THE MALATESTA

WE have discussed Skiffle in these columns on various occasions in the past, and from now on Saturday evenings at the Malatesta Club are likely to be enlivened by the presence of skiffle groups.

This is being done purely in order for its members to study the anthropological and revolutionary implications of the emergence of this social phenomenon in the post-war period (oh yeah?) and in order that serious students shall be encouraged to make use of this facility, the entrance charge on skiffle nights will be only one shilling and sixpence.

#### MALATESTA CLUB

Saturday Night is Skiffle Night  
Saturday, November 2:

THE ATLANTA SKIFFLE GROUP  
from 8 p.m. till you drop.  
Admission and Coffee: 1/6

sitting in judgment on schools, the worst be worse than the Bucks.

### Vladimir

ON what evidence isolated reports (at its last stake) does *FREEDOM* Vladimir Dudintsev, has *Bread Alone*, has Priestley won or lost? Isle of Wight, would appearance? Since ment can render very easily by der what purpose would serve, now that the finds slave labour book has, contradictions, been published edition of 30,000 *Pisatryel*, 7.50 rouble disappearance seem of it.

Lodon.

for nothing more, easy to think so, compared with the more (who might wrong in his ideas) him less honest. The truth in the statement are dishonest—people who follow every this is nothing very little quarrel that is shown in mile of the West one find a show merely decorate academic prejudice of tachism and yend. No more to or filled with p abstract ones will soul. Totalitarian to become one, sh and make it the o be any conception source of ferment the State's will blow.

The painter of will be a lucky worries and comp filled dribbling happy in the know useful. As an inv I've had the the lavatory paper in t of unsaleable wor when needed, how strip.

Newport, Oct. 16.

### Libertarian in Har

Will anyone who ing a Libertarian please communicate

S. E.

12 Park Drive



## LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

# The Tender Trap

tarian. He wants to  
into practice in com-  
which are to be both  
to the question How  
s a beacon light to

l toughie. He doesn't  
about all those com-  
his right to pick and  
shall make. At the  
t any illusions about  
s. They're none of

al softie. He makes  
compromise with the  
but since anarchism  
vernment and author-  
f social organisation,  
voluntary non-coercive  
s for examples of this  
nisation in existing  
strengthen them and

do not exhaust the  
attitudes, and anar-  
onsistent and change-  
se, many of us vacci-  
of them. Who can

say that A. is wrong. The more you  
look at the world to-day, the more you  
feel the need for revolution, however  
quaint or apocalyptic it sounds in British  
or American ears. Is B. wrong, or 'un-  
realistic' as the clever-dicks would have  
it? It seems to me that Danilo Dolci or  
Vinoba Bhave are a good deal more real-  
istic than those who dismiss them with  
a smile. Is C. wrong? Criticism of him  
seems to be a matter of sour grapes if  
he succeeds, or 'I told you so' if he fails.  
Is D. wrong? Who has the right to  
expect him to be a saint? Is E. wrong?  
I am too close to him to say. Certainly  
he runs the risk of whittling down his  
anarchism to a kind of National Council  
of Social Service attitude, but at the  
same time he is affirming precisely that  
difference between anarchism and "non-  
anarchist progressive attitudes" that P.H.  
mentioned in his letter.

The point is well-made by Geoffrey  
Ostergaard in the new issue of the  
*University Libertarian*, when he declares  
that:

"The task of the anarchist is not how-  
ever, to dream about the future society;  
rather it is to act as anarchistically as he  
can within the present society; to avoid

as far as possible situations in which he  
is commanded or is impelled to com-  
mand; and to endeavour to foster rela-  
tions of mutual and voluntary co-opera-  
tion between his fellow-men . . . To  
achieve anarchy, the State must be dis-  
pensed with; and it will be dispensed  
with to the extent that men become  
capable of living without it".

The progressive puts his faith in  
political action, the anarchist seeks to  
by-pass it, the progressive sees the value  
of voluntary associations as an indispen-  
sible adjunct to the machinery of gov-  
ernment, the anarchist wants them to  
grow out of that role into one of respon-  
sibility and autonomy. The difference  
in attitude was illustrated in a radio  
programme to-night (Oct. 21st), on the  
very subject that started this discussion  
—parent-teacher associations. Sir Basil  
Henriques, in explaining the purpose of  
such associations, declared that it was  
no part of their business to take over  
the functions of the school's governors  
or managers. The anarchist on the other  
hand must affirm that this is *precisely*  
what these associations should do, and  
that it is exactly in this direction that  
anarchists should try to influence them.

London.

C.W.

# Independent Schools

marks by C.W. (*People*  
10/57) about the im-  
ministry of Education's  
sing down "objection-  
schools, are given  
letter published in the  
*Supplement* from the  
independent school,  
a wide variety of local  
schools, who writes:

which I have the privi-  
lge master exists because  
dissatisfaction of the  
pils with the schools  
Minister, often on all  
nds, and as often on  
grounds, which boils  
t that the Minister,  
tional system, accepts  
terns of treatment of  
ich these parents,  
of this country, are  
eet to subject their  
d cared-for children.  
e continuing to pay  
se State schools which  
iously unsatisfactory,  
considerable sums of  
each year on paying  
of a school of their  
ugh it struggles per-  
financial difficulties  
many inadequacies of  
o acutely aware, they  
nearly fulfilling their  
nd of education they  
dren.

schools come much nearer to satisfying  
us, he will not dare to describe as  
'objectionable' the school we have  
created at sore cost to ourselves, how-  
ever much it may fail to conform to his  
regulations and standards? Especially  
as there are very many ways in which  
we hope it will never conform to his  
regulations and standards!"

Another question which might be  
asked of the Minister and his inspectors  
is how many of the State's schools meet  
the Ministry's own statutory require-  
ments. How many of the school buildings  
condemned in the famous 1925 Black  
List of the Board of Education are still  
in use? How many classes in both  
primary and secondary schools are larger  
than the Ministry's regulations allow.  
Does he propose to close down what a  
recent writer described as the "shabby  
educational slums" which exist in many  
rural districts?

The Minister of Education, who draws  
a salary of £5,500 a year for doing less  
than nothing, ought to find time to  
answer some of these questions before

sitting in judgment upon independent  
schools, the worst of which could hardly  
be worse than the worst of his.

Bucks.

P.G.

## Vladimir Dudintsev

ON what evidence, other than an  
isolated report in the *News Chroni-  
cle* (at its last gasp in the circulation  
stakes) does FREEDOM believe that Vladi-  
mir Dudintsev, the author of *Not By  
Bread Alone*, has disappeared? If J. B.  
Priestley went on a walking tour in the  
Isle of Wight, would you report his dis-  
appearance? Since the Soviet govern-  
ment can render Dudintsev ineffective  
very easily by denying him publication,  
what purpose would his disappearance  
serve, now that the economy no longer  
finds slave labour economic. Since his  
book has, contrary to Western expecta-  
tions, been published in Moscow in an  
edition of 30,000 copies (*Sovietsky*  
*Pisatyl*, 7.50 roubles), the report of his  
disappearance seems unlikely on the face  
of it.

Lodon.

H.D.P.

## 'A Subtle Sense of the Wacky'

DEAR SIR,

Reviews of art exhibitions in FREEDOM  
are usually so much more stimulating  
and expressive of a different viewpoint  
from other papers—why so few? A  
pity really for it means some important

for nothing more, maybe—it is certainly  
easy to think so, for he risks very little  
compared with the artist who attempts  
more (who might fail or be considered  
wrong in his ideas) but this hardly makes  
him less honest. There is certainly some

FREEDOM

## Please Note

### PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!

#### WEEK 41

Deficit on Freedom £840

Contributions received £592

DEFICIT £248

#### October 11 to October 17

Calgary: B.T. 8/6; Henley: I.W.I. 5/-;  
London: J.N. 1/6; Newton Abbot: E.D.  
£1/5/0; Gateshead: G.D. 1/6; London:  
W.F.\* 3/-; London: Anon.\* 1/5; London:  
J.S.\* 3/-; Glasgow: A.McD. 5/-; Mitcham:  
F.H. 11/-; London: Hyde Park Sympathisers  
2/9; London: P.H. 5/5; Welwyn: Mog\*  
10/-; Los Angeles: "Man" Group, per A.R.  
£5/5/0.

\*Indicates regular contributor.

Total ... 9 8 1  
Previously acknowledged ... 582 14 11

1957 TOTAL TO DATE ... £592 3 0

#### Fire Fund

TOTAL TO DATE ... £382 3 3

GIFTS OF BOOKS: London: C.W.; London:  
K.

## MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

### LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

Every Sunday at 7.30 at  
THE MALATESTA CLUB,  
32 Percy Street,  
Tottenham Court Road, W.1.

#### LECTURE - DISCUSSIONS

OCT. 27—Alan Albon on  
HUMBUGGERY  
NOV. 3—Giovanni Baldelli on  
ANARCHIST ACTION.

NOV. 10—F. A. Ridley on  
THE SOCIAL ORIGINS OF  
SOCIETY

NOV. 17—Francis Tonks on  
VOLUNTARY WORK CAMPS

NOV. 24—Arthur Uloth on  
THE ANARCHIST UTOPIA

DEC. 1—Axel Hoch on  
AM I MY BROTHER'S EATER?

DEC. 8—Bob Green on  
SOME SHIBBOLETHS OF  
ANARCHISM.

Questions, Discussion and Admission  
all free.

### ★ Malatesta Club ★

SWARAJ HOUSE,  
32 PERCY STREET,  
TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD, LONDON, W.1.

#### ACTIVITIES

Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.

London Anarchist Group Meetings  
(see Announcements Column)

Every Wednesday at 8 p.m.



marks by C.W. (People  
(10/57) about the im-  
Ministry of Education's  
ing down "objection-  
t schools, are given  
letter published in the  
Supplement from the  
an independent school,  
a wide variety of local  
y schools, who writes:

which I have the privi-  
dmaster exists because  
dissatisfaction of the  
pils with the schools  
Minister, often on all  
ands, and as often on  
grounds, which boils  
et that the Minister,  
tional system, accepts  
terns of treatment of  
hich these parents,  
of this country, are  
deed to subject their  
e cared-for children.  
le continuing to pay  
ese State schools which  
riously unsatisfactory,  
considerable sums of  
each year on paying  
of a school of their  
ugh it struggles per-  
financial difficulties  
many inadequacies of  
o acutely aware, they  
e nearly fulfilling their  
nd of education they  
ldren.

the Minister appears  
efficient and suitable  
erage by our own not  
erience of his schools  
horror, and wish to  
from it and to pro-  
at we regard as much  
r educational patterns  
of deliberate choice,  
ent from those which  
e of my teaching staff,  
e work here, possess  
ions at all. But they  
qualifications which  
hly and which are all  
king in the staff-rooms  
ools. There are hun-  
eds of teachers in the  
ment whom I would  
lowing near my pupils  
ever achieve the stan-  
selves—yet they are  
nt and suitable' by the

expect his inspectors  
ve proved themselves  
efficient and suitable'  
r's educational system  
been given posts of  
ty for its maintenance  
approve of our ways.  
an assurance from the  
such time as his own

## Hard Question'

the article by Colin  
e above title has been  
readers who ordered  
result of the sugges-  
in FREEDOM 24/8/57).

hundred of these leaf-  
They may be obtain-  
Press for 2s. per 100.

schools come much nearer to satisfying us, he will not dare to describe as 'objectionable' the school we have created at sore cost to ourselves, however much it may fail to conform to his regulations and standards? Especially as there are very many ways in which we hope it will never conform to his regulations and standards!"

Another question which might be asked of the Minister and his inspectors is how many of the State's schools meet the Ministry's own statutory requirements. How many of the school buildings condemned in the famous 1925 Black List of the Board of Education are still in use? How many classes in both primary and secondary schools are larger than the Ministry's regulations allow. Does he propose to close down what a recent writer described as the "shabby educational slums" which exist in many rural districts?

The Minister of Education, who draws a salary of £5,500 a year for doing less than nothing, ought to find time to answer some of these questions before

## 'A Subtle Sense of the Wacky'

DEAR SIR,

Reviews of art exhibitions in FREEDOM are usually so much more stimulating and expressive of a different viewpoint from other papers—why so few? A pity really for it means some important shows get passed over and a few second-rate ones get a decent write-up. Thinking over last week's article I am not at all sure that D.R. would agree with this statement. A few remarks in the opening paragraphs on the "usefulness" of pictures have me a little worried. The purpose of painting as I see it is to communicate, or express oneself, through plastic means to others, as is done with words or music—if this is so, then surely we should expect more than a decorative wall panel from manipulators of paint. Is honesty such a prerogative of the decorative painter? If he tries

## SKIFFLE AT THE MALATESTA

WE have discussed Skiffle in these columns on various occasions in the past, and from now on Saturday evenings at the Malatesta Club are likely to be enlivened by the presence of skiffle groups.

This is being done purely in order for its members to study the anthropological and revolutionary implications of the emergence of this social phenomenon in the post-war period (oh yeah?) and in order that serious students shall be encouraged to make use of this facility, the entrance charge on skiffle nights will be only one shilling and sixpence.

### MALATESTA CLUB

Saturday Night is Skiffle Night  
Saturday, November 2:

THE ATLANTA SKIFFLE GROUP  
from 8 p.m. till you drop.  
Admission and Coffee: 1/6

sitting in judgment upon independent schools, the worst of which could hardly be worse than the worst of his.  
Bucks. P.G.

## Vladimir Dudintsev

ON what evidence, other than an isolated report in the *News Chronicle* (at its last gasp in the circulation stakes) does FREEDOM believe that Vladimir Dudintsev, the author of *Not By Bread Alone*, has disappeared? If J. B. Priestley went on a walking tour in the Isle of Wight, would you report his disappearance? Since the Soviet government can render Dudintsev ineffective very easily by denying him publication, what purpose would his disappearance serve, now that the economy no longer finds slave labour economic. Since his book has, contrary to Western expectations, been published in Moscow in an edition of 30,000 copies (*Sovietsky Pisatyl*, 7.50 roubles), the report of his disappearance seems unlikely on the face of it.

Lodon.

H.D.P.

for nothing more, maybe—it is certainly easy to think so, for he risks very little compared with the artist who attempts more (who might fail or be considered wrong in his ideas) but this hardly makes him less honest. There is certainly some truth in the statement that some painters are dishonest—perhaps amongst those who follow every twist of fashion—but this is nothing new. There should be very little quarrel really with the stuff that is shown in the ambitious square mile of the West End. How often does one find a show which does more than merely decorate wall space? Forget academic prejudice—accept the technique of tachism and your troubles are at an end. No more to become hot with anger or filled with pity, emotions except abstract ones will be purged from the soul. Totalitarian States, or those about to become one, should embrace tachism and make it the official style—gone will be any conception of the rebel—one source of fermenting ideas contrary to the State's will be neutralised at one blow.

The painter of this brave new world will be a lucky man—purged of all worries and complexes his days will be filled dribbling his paint everywhere, happy in the knowledge that he is being useful. As an investment for the future, I've had the thought of painting on lavatory paper in the new idiom. Storage of unsaleable work will be solved and, when needed, how simple to tear off a strip.

Newport, Oct. 16. MILWARD CASEY.

## Libertarian Group in Hampstead

Will anyone who is interested in forming a Libertarian Group in Hampstead please communicate with:

S. E. PARKER,

12 Park Drive, London, N.W.11.

Every Sunday at 7.30 at  
THE MALATESTA CLUB,  
32 Percy Street,  
Tottenham Court Road, W.1.

## LECTURE - DISCUSSIONS

OCT. 27—Alan Albon on  
HUMBUGGERY

NOV. 3—Giovanni Baldelli on  
ANARCHIST ACTION.

NOV. 10—F. A. Ridley on  
THE SOCIAL ORIGINS OF  
SOCIETY

NOV. 17—Francis Tonks on  
VOLUNTARY WORK CAMPS

NOV. 24—Arthur Uloth on  
THE ANARCHIST UTOPIA

DEC. 1—Axel Hoch on  
AM I MY BROTHER'S EATER?

DEC. 8—Bob Green on  
SOME SHIBBOLETHS OF  
ANARCHISM.

Questions, Discussion and Admission  
all free.

## ★ Malatesta Club ★

SWARAJ HOUSE,  
32 PERCY STREET,  
TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD, LONDON, W.1.

### ACTIVITIES

Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.

London Anarchist Group Meetings  
(see Announcements Column)

Every Wednesday at 8 p.m.

BONAR THOMPSON speaks

OCT. 23—Subject to be announced.

OCT. 30—Some interesting people.

NOV. 6—By request—a dramatic  
recital.

NOV. 13—The glories of Socialism, etc.

NOV. 20—"THE WORK OF BONAR  
THOMPSON" ON TAPE RECORD-  
INGS. A new selection from D.C.'s  
collection of Thompson records.  
Guaranteed brilliant.

## INTERNATIONAL ANARCHIST CENTRE MEETINGS

Discussion Meetings

every Thursday at 8 p.m.

OCT. 31—Discussion led by  
S. E. Parker on  
ANARCHISM AS I SEE IT.

Every Friday and Saturday:

SOCIAL EVENINGS

## FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

Postal Subscription Rates:

12 months 19/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)

6 months 9/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)

3 months 5/- (U.S.A. \$0.75)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies

12 months 29/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)

6 months 14/6 (U.S.A. \$2.25)

Cheques, P.O.'s and Money Orders should  
be made out to FREEDOM PRESS, crossed  
a/c Payee, and addressed to the publishers

FREEDOM PRESS

27 Red Lion Street

London, W.C.1. England

Tel.: Chancery 8364



cracy is a democratic-  
t is, after all,  
at an election  
at this country  
of both sexes  
rtified insane  
alternatives (so  
y choose the  
k is going to  
ocracy means  
selves and it  
to think of  
selves in a  
en the people  
certified in-  
ople govern  
es of their  
who take  
m in the way  
e), must be  
wrong some-  
easoning that  
which case

## Political lease!

campaign in  
omic Minister  
ng 86 speeches  
ases if voters  
been badly let  
coalmine man-  
days after the  
ed a price rise

the political  
told 250 of  
ting in Essen:  
b. You have  
Your price in-  
estion. I will  
uns."

the coalmen's  
er rises from  
s broke into a  
stopped by the  
orkers' Union's

led to the six-  
Steel Commu-  
thold appro-  
increase. To  
d wheeled up  
weapon—his  
eting imports  
arter, he order-  
e schemes to  
eign oil and  
end the mine  
their prices  
ornly getting  
ow-priced im-  
st has knock-

agers had the  
ans instead of  
e patience to  
g their prices.  
efore the pub-  
uring election  
ime the coal-  
raised their  
have thought

cratic government is to do things  
the people want done—in a word  
*popular* things. Yet all we get are  
Ministers dashing around the coun-  
try patting themselves on the back  
and saying what splendid fellows  
they are because they are making  
themselves so thoroughly unpopular.

And they clearly recognise that in  
doing so they are increasing the  
feeling among the electorate that  
there ought to be an election, so that  
we might have a chance to throw  
out this unpopular lot. But the  
Government is determined to hang  
on and make itself even more un-  
popular, thereby, we assume, prov-  
ing its tenacious, bulldog spirit, stern  
sense of duty, and insistence upon  
serving the people right whether  
they like it or not. As Mr. Harold  
Macmillan, our brilliant Prime Min-  
ister (to quote a friend of his), said,  
"We are not going to run away". He  
is going to stand and dish it out.

Rubbing it in a little further, Dr.  
Charles Hill said at Derby last week

do all sorts of unpleasant things to  
people for their own good. If you  
read carefully Comrade Khrush-  
chev's courageous repudiation of  
Stalin, presented to an admiring  
world three years after the old dic-  
tator was safely dead, you will see  
that there was no denunciation of  
the unpopular measures which  
Uncle Joe forced upon the Russian  
people.

It was, and still is in Communist  
eyes, a gauge of Stalin's greatness  
that he was able to make the Rus-  
sians thoroughly uncomfortable for  
nearly three decades and maintain  
himself in power, though unpopular  
(to put it mildly) even among his  
own comrades and at a cost of a  
mere—what?—twenty million lives?  
This is the stuff of greatness, and  
even the denunciation of it denotes  
courage of a high order.

### Devotion to Duty

And after Hungary, no-one can  
doubt that a Communist Govern-  
ment is the equal of a Conservative

Cousins would ever flinch from  
taking unpopular decisions if they  
conceived them to be in the interests  
of the nation?

We are, quite clearly, living in  
stirring times. Not for us the ener-  
vating, degenerating atmosphere of  
appeasement between government  
and people. Thank goodness we  
are not to be insulted with the spec-  
tacle of a decadent ruling class cur-  
rying favour with its subjects, of a  
degenerate senate trying to give its  
people what they want.

No, none of that perversion of  
democracy for us. Instead, we have  
stern righteousness. And as the  
Government introduces measure  
after measure which it knows we  
shall not like, we know, deep down,  
that it is all for our own good. We  
can almost hear an echo from days  
gone by, when father used to get  
busy with his slipper: "This hurts  
me more than it hurts you."

We didn't believe it then and we  
don't believe it now.

## SPUTNIKITIS

THE full implications of Sputnik's  
arrival off the scene are as yet  
unknown. On the one hand it is  
stated that the ability to place a  
satellite in a stable orbit round the  
earth is conclusive proof of the pos-  
session of a reliable inter-continental  
ballistic weapon, but alternatively it  
is stated with equal force that such  
an assumption is very far from being  
an established fact.

Some would have us believe that  
a little thing like a satellite is merely  
elementary stuff compared with the  
complications involved in directing  
an explosive missile from say,  
Washington or its environs to, say,  
Moscow or thereabouts. Others are  
most anxious to impress upon us  
that if you can achieve a Sputnik,  
then it almost goes without saying  
that to direct an explosive missile  
from, say, Moscow to, say, Wash-  
ington is simplicity itself.

Whichever argument is correct,  
though in all probability both are  
quite inaccurate, the point is some-  
what superfluous. What is perhaps  
of greater moment is the actual effect  
which Sputnik is having upon world  
opinion and world thinking. How-  
ever it is necessary to state why the  
point is of such little importance; it  
is for this reason. If the USSR does  
*not* possess an ICBM then they can-  
not use it, if the USSR does possess  
such a contrivance its existence is  
virtually cancelled out either because  
the USA also possesses one (which  
seems unlikely at this particular  
time), or for the reason that the  
USA by virtue of its alliances and  
pacts with countries which surround

the USSR is in a position to unleash  
a counter-offensive (in the event of  
being attacked) against the USSR,  
which will at least be sufficient to  
deter that country as much as the  
USA is itself deterred, from making  
an attack in the first place.

In other words Russian techno-  
logical achievement is roughly equal,  
expressed in terms of aggression, to  
American technological achievement  
plus geographical position.

Hitherto the USA has considered  
itself in a superior position to the  
USSR—it was reckoned that both  
countries would have to use the old-  
fashioned aeroplane to make a suc-  
cessful attack. This left the USA in  
a better position mainly on geogra-  
phical grounds. Now it may well  
be that this state of superiority no  
longer exists, and has been replaced  
by one of equality. This, in a sense,  
could be regarded as a balance of  
power devoutly to be wished, for if  
neither side is convinced of its own  
ability to win then neither side will  
risk an attack.

From all of which it may be de-  
duced that the important thing is  
the international game of conse-  
quences—or what the world thinks.

Sputnik is reported as having  
made a tremendous impact upon the  
nations of Afro-Asia; this is under-  
standable, and from an American  
point of view a deafening blow. The  
hundreds of millions of Afro-Asians  
have no doubt regarded the battle  
of the giants of East and West as  
an ideological hostility based on dif-  
ferences in economic and political  
structure, with the "up-and-coming"

Communist system as roughly equal  
in strength to the existing materia-  
list-capitalist Western system. But  
where Communism might have an  
edge over Capitalism so far as a  
rational type of society was con-  
cerned, Capitalism had achieved a  
greater measure of success in terms  
of a better standard of living due  
in the main to a higher state of  
technological progress. Sputnik may  
have a startling effect upon these  
general attitudes, for it apparently  
represents the point at which Eastern  
technology has overtaken the West.

This is very far from being the  
truth on all levels except the one in  
question, but for many people it is  
the thin end of the wedge, for them  
the Russians are no longer a back-  
ward people, they have lifted them-  
selves out of the mire by their boot-  
laces and Communism can therefore  
be said to work.

It would be idle to suggest that it  
is all quite as simple as that, but it  
may well be *the kind of thinking*  
which is going on in the minds of  
uncommitted peoples throughout the  
world, particularly where those  
peoples have no reason to be sym-  
pathetic towards the West which has  
done so little for them.

It is all very dangerous, and a ter-  
rible expression of a world in which  
it appears to be obligatory to take  
sides, despite the obvious fact that  
neither side is worth supporting.

That the grounds for supporting  
either side should be its greater  
ability to destroy the other is not  
only frightening in its irrationality  
but is also a horrifying indication of  
a completely false set of values.

to be an  
up in the  
the lucky  
the ones  
thoughts  
view, for  
to sea bu  
there?  
nuclear w  
local to a  
where wo  
to a par  
radio-acti  
plosions  
fight. . .  
Mr. S  
unconsci  
views, wh  
"It is tr  
what is  
back' war,  
a nuclear  
be the first  
low down  
military ex  
do not gov  
with a glo  
defend our  
got."

So far  
lag betwe  
first phase  
war woul  
not days  
then on s  
academic  
or sea, th  
ourselves  
terms of  
quickly a  
troying yo  
is effective  
For pe  
nuclear w  
quickest  
say the le  
possible.  
politicians  
that ther  
nuclear at  
and it is i  
such an a  
not cause  
ultimate  
human ra

### Hints

For the f  
blockade, t  
off Germa  
linking We  
Armed Re  
leave East  
trying to e  
sealed off,  
wohl went  
to jolt his  
gave East  
in all their  
rushed to  
get one ne  
one was a  
than 300  
£5 15s. 0d.  
a six-day  
der, busin  
Berlin foun  
session of  
marks that  
worthless.



# Independent Schools

THE recent remarks by C.W. (*People and Ideas* 12/10/57) about the impudence of the Ministry of Education's machinery for closing down "objectionable" independent schools, are given added point by a letter published in the *Times Educational Supplement* from the headmaster of an independent school, with experience of a wide variety of local education authority schools, who writes:

"The school of which I have the privilege to be the headmaster exists because of the profound dissatisfaction of the parents of my pupils with the schools provided by the Minister, often on all of these very grounds, and as often on much more serious grounds, which boils down to the fact that the Minister, through his educational system, accepts and condones patterns of treatment of children to which these parents, thoughtful citizens of this country, are very-unwilling indeed to subject their own well-loved and cared-for children. As a result, while continuing to pay taxes to finance these State schools which they regard as seriously unsatisfactory, they also spend considerable sums of hard-earned money each year on paying for the existence of a school of their own which, although it struggles permanently against financial difficulties and suffers from many inadequacies of which we are all too acutely aware, they yet regard as more nearly fulfilling their concept of the kind of education they desire for their children.

"Much of what the Minister appears to regard as 'efficient and suitable instruction'—to judge by our own not inconsiderable experience of his schools—we regard with horror, and wish to protect our children from it and to provide them with what we regard as much better fare; so our educational patterns and methods are, of deliberate choice, considerably different from those which he endorses. Some of my teaching staff, hand-picked for the work here, possess no paper qualifications at all. But they do possess other qualifications which we prize very highly and which are all too often sadly lacking in the staff-rooms of the State's schools. There are hundreds upon hundreds of teachers in the Minister's employment whom I would never dream of allowing near my pupils and who could never achieve the standards we set ourselves—yet they are regarded as 'efficient and suitable' by the Minister.

"Nor would we expect his inspectors—people who have proved themselves so thoroughly 'efficient and suitable' inside the Minister's educational system that they have been given posts of special responsibility for its maintenance—to understand or approve of our ways.

"May we have an assurance from the Minister that until such time as his own

schools come much nearer to satisfying us, he will not dare to describe as 'objectionable' the school we have created at sore cost to ourselves, however much it may fail to conform to his regulations and standards? Especially as there are very many ways in which we hope it will never conform to his regulations and standards!"

Another question which might be asked of the Minister and his inspectors is how many of the State's schools meet the Ministry's own statutory requirements. How many of the school buildings condemned in the famous 1925 Black List of the Board of Education are still in use? How many classes in both primary and secondary schools are larger than the Ministry's regulations allow. Does he propose to close down what a recent writer described as the "shabby educational slums" which exist in many rural districts?

The Minister of Education, who draws a salary of £5,500 a year for doing less than nothing, ought to find time to answer some of these questions before

sitting in judgment upon independent schools, the worst of which could hardly be worse than the worst of his.

Bucks. P.G.

## Vladimir Dudintsev

ON what evidence, other than an isolated report in the *News Chronicle* (at its last gasp in the circulation stakes) does FREEDOM believe that Vladimir Dudintsev, the author of *Not By Bread Alone*, has disappeared? If J. B. Priestley went on a walking tour in the Isle of Wight, would you report his disappearance? Since the Soviet government can render Dudintsev ineffective very easily by denying him publication, what purpose would his disappearance serve, now that the economy no longer finds slave labour economic. Since his book has, contrary to Western expectations, been published in Moscow in an edition of 30,000 copies (*Sovitsky Pisatel*, 7.50 roubles), the report of his disappearance seems unlikely on the face of it.

Lodon.

H.D.P.

## 'A Subtle Sense of the Wacky'

DEAR SIR,

Reviews of art exhibitions in FREEDOM are usually so much more stimulating and expressive of a different viewpoint from other papers—why so few? A pity really for it means some important shows get passed over and a few second-rate ones get a decent write-up. Thinking over last week's article I am not at all sure that D.R. would agree with this statement. A few remarks in the opening paragraphs on the "usefulness" of pictures have me a little worried. The purpose of painting as I see it is to communicate, or express oneself, through plastic means to others, as is done with words or music—if this is so, then surely we should expect more than a decorative wall panel from manipulators of paint. Is honesty such a prerogative of the decorative painter? If he tries

for nothing more, maybe—it is certainly easy to think so, for he risks very little compared with the artist who attempts more (who might fail or be considered wrong in his ideas) but this hardly makes him less honest. There is certainly some truth in the statement that some painters are dishonest—perhaps amongst those who follow every twist of fashion—but this is nothing new. There should be very little quarrel really with the stuff that is shown in the ambitious square mile of the West End. How often does one find a show which does more than merely decorate wall space? Forget academic prejudice—accept the technique of tachism and your troubles are at an end. No more to become hot with anger or filled with pity, emotions except abstract ones will be purged from the soul. Totalitarian States, or those about to become one, should embrace tachism and make it the official style—gone will be any conception of the rebel—one source of fermenting ideas contrary to the State's will be neutralised at one blow.

The painter of this brave new world will be a lucky man—purged of all worries and complexes his days will be filled dribbling his paint everywhere, happy in the knowledge that he is being useful. As an investment for the future, I've had the thought of painting on lavatory paper in the new idiom. Storage of unsaleable work will be solved and, when needed, how simple to tear off a strip.

Newport, Oct. 16. MILWARD CASEY.

## Libertarian Group in Hampstead

Will anyone who is interested in forming a Libertarian Group in Hampstead please communicate with:

S. E. PARKER,  
12 Park Drive, London, N.W.11.

## SKIFFLE AT THE MALATESTA

WE have discussed Skiffle in these columns on various occasions in the past, and from now on Saturday evenings at the Malatesta Club are likely to be enlivened by the presence of skiffle groups.

This is being done purely in order for its members to study the anthropological and revolutionary implications of the emergence of this social phenomenon in the post-war period (oh yeah?) and in order that serious students shall be encouraged to make use of this facility, the entrance charge on skiffle nights will be only one shilling and sixpence.

### MALATESTA CLUB

Saturday Night is Skiffle Night  
Saturday, November 2:

THE ATLANTA SKIFFLE GROUP  
from 8 p.m. till you drop.  
Admission and Coffee: 1/6

## 'The Awkward Question'

THE reprint of the article by Colin Ward with the above title has been circulated to those readers who ordered quantities. (As a result of the suggestion for a reprint in FREEDOM 24/8/57).

There are a few hundred of these leaflets still available. They may be obtained from Freedom Press for 2s. per 100.

LONDON  
GROUP

Every Su

THE MA

32 Percy

Tottenham

LECTURE

OCT. 27

HUMBU

NOV. 3

ANAR

NOV

THE S

SOCIET

NOV. 17

VOLUN

NOV. 24

THE AN

DEC. 1

AM I M

DEC. 8

SOME S

ANAR

Questions

all free.

★ Ma

TOTTENHAM

Every Su

London

(see An

Every Su

BONAR

OCT. 23

OCT. 30

NOV. 6

recital.

NOV. 13

NOV. 20

THOMP

INGS.

collection

Guarante

INTERNA

CENTRE

Discuss

every Th

OCT. 31

S. E. Par

ANAR

Every Frid

F

The A

Postal Su

12 mont

6 mont

3 mont

Special Su

12 mont

6 mont

Cheques,

be made c

a/c Payee,

F R E

27

London